DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 517 EC 062 461

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Ersing, Walter F., Ed. |
| TITLE | A Study of Training Needs in the Programming of Physical Education and Recreation for the Mentally Retarded and Physically Handicapped: A Report of the Midwest Regional Institute for Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation. |
| INSTITUTION | Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Herschel W. Nisonger Center.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus. School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Bureau of Education for the Handicapped (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 71 |
| NOTE | 87p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.75 HC-$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE |
| DESCRIPTORS | Educational Needs; *Exceptional Child Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); Manpower Needs; *Mentally Handicapped; *Physical Education; *Physically Handicapped; Recreation; State Programs; Teacher Education; Trend Analysis |

ABSTRACT

Presented are proceedings from a 3-day midwest regional institute held in 1971 for state level personnel and university leaders on training needs in areas of physical education and recreation for mentally and physically handicapped children and adults. Two presentations given discuss the design and purpose of regional training institutes and theoretical ideas involved in education. Training perspectives are covered in two presentations concerning needs of special education, and needs of physical education and recreation. Issues, problems, and needs are delineated in reports from Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin. Also reported from each of the states are an action plan, which usually includes a statement of the problem, objectives, scope, resources, and a concluding statement. Listed as a result of the reports are the 20 most pressing issues/concerns for physical education/recreation. Development of a state plan is the first priority of 10 issues, and cooperation among special education, physical education and recreation is the first priority of 10 issues for special education. Ten conclusions concerning the institute are listed including acquisition of new information by participants, and need to change the prevailing apathetic public attitude about physical education for the handicapped. (Listed in appendixes are institute personnel, resource participants, and institute participants; provided are evaluation and order forms.) (MC)

ED 094517

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

# A STUDY OF TRAINING NEEDS IN THE PROGRAMMING OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Report Of The Midwest Regional Institute
For Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation

**Center of Tomorrow**
**The Ohio State University**
**September 15-17, 1971**

**Edited by Walter F. Ersing**

**Sponsored by**
**Bureau of Education for the Handicapped**
**U.S. Office of Education**

**In Cooperation With**
**The School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation**
**College of Education**
**and**
**The Nisonger Center**
**The Ohio State University**
**Columbus, Ohio**

EC 062461

**The project presented or reported herein was performed in conjunction with a Grant from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The editor of this report is deeply indebted to the many who provided their assistance before and during the conference.

To Mr. Robert Holland, who provided consultation and support as a member of the Institute's Advisory Committee, I am deeply appreciative. To doctoral student, Mr. Joseph Huber, who also served on the Advisory Committee as well as provide valuable assistance in reviewing this final document, I am especially grateful.

In the conduct of the Institute, it was necessary to draw upon student and faculty resources of The Ohio State University and other institutions. The assistance of Mr. Michael Loovis, a Master's trainee in adapted physical education who fulfilled certain administrative duties, was most helpful. Personal contributions necessary for the realization of the Institute were provided by Dr. Donald Anderson, Associate Dean, College of Education; the reactor panel members, Dr. Orville Johnson, Chairman, Faculty of Exceptional Children of The Ohio State University; Dr. Louis Alley, Director, Department of Health and Physical Education, University of Iowa, Dr. Donald McCullaugh, Department of Physical Education and Recreation, University of South Dakota; and Dr. William Chasey for conducting the Adelphi Survey. Also, the secretarial activities essential to the preparation of the manuscript were fulfilled by Miss Debra Edmondson and Miss Jackie Hosley. To them I am deeply appreciative.

The cooperation of the speakers and all the participants and their seriousness of involvement were essential ingredients to the Institute and to the final realization of this report.

The Midwest Institute on Training Needs in The Programming of Physical Education and Recreation was made possible by a grant from the United States Office of Education through its Division on Training of the Bureau for the

Education of the Handicapped. We are indebted to the Bureau for their support and particularly to Mr. William Hillman for his leadership in encouraging the development of the training institutes. We wish to thank also the resource participants and Dr. Julian Stein, Director, Programs for the Handicapped, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation for their support in providing information and materials for the Institute.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Contents | vii |
| Introduction | xi |
| Part I General Presentations | 1 |
| "Regional Training Institutes: Their Design and Purpose," William Hillman, Jr., Bureau of Education for the Handicapped | 2 |
| "Knowledge, Society, and Individual: What Is Essential?" Dr. Jack R. Frymier, The Ohio State University | 5 |
| Part II Training Perspectives in Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation | 17 |
| "What's Happening and What Should be Happening in Special Education," Dr. James Beaber, The Ohio State University | 18 |
| "What's Happening And What Should Be Happening In Physical Education and Recreation," Dr. Julian Stein, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation | 23 |
| Part III Institute Deliberations | 31 |
| Section A Exploration and Identification of Issues, Problems and Needs | 32 |
| Illinois Report | 35 |
| Indiana Report | 36 |
| Iowa Report | 37 |
| Michigan Report | 38 |
| Minnesota Report | 39 |
| Missouri Report | 40 |
| North Dakota Report | 41 |
| Ohio Report | 42 |
| South Dakota Report | 43 |
| Wisconsin Report | 44 |
| Section B State Team Action Plans | 46 |
| Illinois Model | 47 |
| Indiana Model | 49 |
| Iowa Model | 52 |
| Michigan Model | 54 |
| Minnesota Model | 56 |
| Missouri Model | 58 |
| North Dakota Model | 59 |
| Ohio Model | 60 |
| South Dakota Model | 61 |
| Wisconsin Model | 62 |

| | Page |
|---|---|
| Part IV Summary | 64 |
| Adelphi Study - A Survey of Training Needs, Issues and Problems As Identified By Institute Participants | 65 |
| General Conclusions | 68 |
| Appendix A Institute Personnel | 71 |
| Appendix B Institute Plan and Evaluation | 76 |
| Appendix C Report Order Form | 80 |

# INTRODUCTION

The responsibility of meeting the challenge of providing physical education and recreation programs for the nation's seven million handicapped children is an enormous one with many implications. A committment to improving the various training opportunities for personnel involved in administering or teaching in these programs brought interdisciplinary teams from ten states to the Midwest Regional Institute for Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation at The Ohio State University in September, 1971.

The primary purpose of the Midwest Regional Institute was to provide the means by which state level personnel and/or college or university leaders from special education, physical education and recreation could stimulate the development of various training opportunities for the purpose of enhancing programs of physical education and recreation for the retarded and physically handicapped children. Each state's interdisciplinary team at the Institute consisted of a representative from each discipline. In addition, project directors in physical education and recreation from the participating states served as resource personnel to the state teams as needed throughout the Institute. The states represented at the Midwest Institute were Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

The specific objectives of the Midwest Institute focused on by the participants were:

1. Jointly explore and identify the kinds of training needs in physical education and recreation for administrators, teachers and lay people in these fields or related areas within each participating state and the region as a whole.

2. Jointly plan and develop within a state plan various training models for each state in the form of institutes, workshops, seminars, short courses, or any other training means to meet the needs identified by each particular state.

3. Jointly explore and identify the kinds of financial resources available at the state and federal level from the three

participating areas and/or any institutional resources within the state which would provide support and permit implementation of the training models jointly developed by special education, physical education and recreation.

4. Develop a time plan for implementing training model/s within a state and/or in the region as may be projected by the conference participants.

Although participation was limited to personnel from state departments and/or college or university leaders, the institute did provide for a cross section of representation from special education, physical education and recreation. However, it was planned to prepare and distribute widely proceedings of the institute in order that others might share from the interaction of those individuals who participated in the Institute. With such balanced representation, it was felt that such sharing would be meaningful.

The material in this publication has been derived from 1) a high input general presentation session, 2) an exploration and identification session, 3) an action plan development session, and 4) a survey of needs and problems in physical education and recreation as viewed by the participants. The general sessions were designed to provide personal interaction between the team representatives and presenters. The remaining sessions were designed to provide maximum interaction among each state team for the purpose of establishing discipline awareness, exploring common and unique problems and developing an action plan for an identified need.

It is anticipated that this Institute and the materials emanating from it will serve as a means for change and as a base for other activitess in the professional preparation of personnel involved in programs of physical education and recreation for the mentally retarded and physically disabled.

# PART I

## GENERAL PRESENTATIONS

## Regional Training Institutes: Their Design and Purpose

Mr. William Hillman, Jr.
Division on Training Programs
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped

A recent review of the impact of the Physical Education and Recreation Training Program for the handicapped by personnel of Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and the specific consultants to this program revealed some critical areas of concern.

The accomplishments of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped training program to date include the support of curricula planning and program development in approximately 15 universities and colleges and several (2) summer short term projects during fiscal years 1970 and 1971. In FY 1971 several of the planning programs began limited student support with minimal funds. For FY 1972, the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped recently announced intentions of supporting 26 universities and colleges in physical education and recreation (21 with student support, 4 with planning and program development and 1 with technical assistance).

An individual review of the operational programs suggests that only a few of the programs have extended their training influence beyond the confines of the university or the local situation. Few of the schools have conducted workshops or institutes on physical education and recreation for the handicapped children on a state and national level, therefore, it was recommended by the panel of consultants that a series of institutes be conducted involving state level and university/college personnel on the subject of manpower and training.

### The Problem in Focus

The inclusion of physical education and recreation services to the handicapped child with its existing manpower supply is a basic need if we are to aid

in meeting the demands of future programming in all services to the handicapped. Training is necessary to fully utilize generalist, up-date specialist and prepare new personnel.

The development of training resources for physical education and recreation for handicapped children has been limited in its scope due to fiscal and human resources during the past few years.

In an effort to have further impact and more fully developed training programs at all levels in relation to physical education and recreation for the handicapped, the need to involve personnel concerned with the full dimensions of services to the handicapped is recognized. The involvement of state level personnel as well as college or university dealing with special education, recreation and physical education services is seen as imperative for future growth in these training programs.

Institutes: Their Objectives and End Products

The use of regional institutes as one means to extend the influence of present training programs of physical education and recreation can be an effective tool to accomplish several objectives in developing solutions to the problem noted previously. More specifically the regional institutes hopefully will effect communication between personnel of various state agencies and institutions of higher learning directly concerned with training for work with handicapped children. Secondly, such institutes will serve as a means to investigate the existing training sources as well as determine other potential resources for training in physical education and recreation for the handicapped children. Finally, the development of an outline of a state plan for effective preparation of personnel in physical education and recreation for handicapped children will be possible through regional meetings.

The anticipated outcomes from such institutes could make essential contributions to the furure growth of training programs in physical education and

recreation. The regional approach could serve to produce the following end products:

1. The interaction of state agency, university and college, and service personnel relating to training of Physical Education and Recreation personnel to work with handicapped children.
2. A suggested State plan from each State participating on how to increase training resources related to Physical Education and Recreation. These plans could include model institutes.
3. The development of specific training institutes and course work in SEA's universities and colleges and other related agencies.

It is anticipated the institutes will utilize a variety of formats in meeting the objectives as well as vary in the degree to which the general objectives are met or in establishing other objectives. Similarly, the final product of each institute will be unique for each region and shaped to the needs identified by the participants.

Knowledge, Society, and the Individual:
What is Essential?

Jack R. Frymier
Professor and Chairman
Curriculum and Foundations
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

I am very pleased and honored to be with you this morning. I would like to explore what I think is a rather complex set of ideas. I will not be able to do it completely or with any kind of justice. What I will do is to sketch in parameters of my own thinking and hope that maybe there will be some touchstones that you can tie into or some ideas that may be appropriate to your own thinking. I will acknowledge at the outset that this is not going to be a nice neat tidy speech which I can summarize - 1, 2, 3, - and draw a line at the end -- it won't come out that way. I'm not going to apologize though because I am hopeful that the ideas will be interesting and useful to you as they have been to me.

One doesn't have to be very bright or very perceptive to recognize that the whole field of education is in pretty serious trouble. I am not going to go through all the things associated with that, but in many ways I think we are beginning a serious reassessment of the entire education endeavor. It is disturbing and discouraging for those of us who have been in education to recognize that even though the last ten or fifteen years have been years of fantastic effort, tremendous innovation and monumental investment of energy, resources and money, it is very difficult to find people who feel good about education, let alone feeling satisfied about education. Almost everybody is uncomfortable, dissatisfied, irritated and aggravated. A lot of talk is about the concern for money, so we have the present accountability.

I was interested to hear Dan Murial from the School Counsel in London give a presentation at Denver about a month ago. She said, "You know in 1870 the British Parliament passed a law called Payment By Results. The idea was to pay people for what children learn. That was so striking and the people who had responsibility in education were so upset about it, that it immediately resulted in the formation of the British Teachers Union, the equivalent of the NEA. For 22 years the professional people in England fought that law and in 1892 they finally got that law repealed." She said, "I have been in America this summer and all I hear is talk about accountability and payment by results. I am very disappointed that those of you here in the colonies haven't learned from our experience of 100 years ago about the futility of accountability and futility of payment by results. Here you are, more than a century later, starting down the same blind alley that we started down one hundred years ago; I'm disappointed that you haven't learned from us."

I realize we have problems like accountability and there is a great uncomfortableness in education. The paradox is that it follows a period of tremendous effort, tremendous output, tremendous innovation; yet by almost any assessment there is a very serious feeling that most of these efforts to improve education have not paid off. You know we have had more money, more resources, more time, and more talent; we have had more of everything than we have had before, but

have not been able to solve the problems satisfactorily. So we are once again at a point where everybody is poking his finger at education and pressing real hard. It seems to me the question is, are we going to respond in the same way or a different way? I think we have to respond differently. I am intrigued and impressed by what Peter Drucker has to say in his book, Age of Discontinuities. Drucker is an economist -- and I am leery of economists when they talk about education -- but he makes some points which I think are very useful to anybody concerned about education. He says, for example, that eight thousand years ago in Mesopotamia, the people who were the teachers, called scribes, were also the very same people who were physicians and healers. He said if those teachers who lived in ancient Mesopotamia came to America today and walked into the operating room of a modern hospital, those people who had been transported through time and space wouldn't have any idea what was going on and would be completely astonished. But if those people walked into a classroom of America today they would feel at home. He said everything has changed in the field of medicine; almost nothing has changed in the field of education in eight thousand years. We have carpet on the floor, and people don't take sticks and draw in the sand but have little white things and draw on boards. But for all practical purposes, education goes on now just like education eight thousand years ago.

Then Drucker makes a very important point: the fact of the matter is that during that intervening eight thousand years, physicians have not grown to be more intelligent; they are no brighter men than they were eight thousand years ago. In the same way, people who work in education are no less intelligent than they were eight thousand years ago. It is not a problem of intelligence; the basic difference is that people in the field of medicine have developed new tools. Some are conceptual, theoretical tools, and some are artifacts, or operational tools. Medicine has developed new tools which have enabled physicians to both expand and extend the impact of their work in their effort to help and heal their fellow man.

In education there has been only one new tool developed in eight thousand years. That is the book, and Drucker says most people who use that tool don't know how to use it or they wouldn't lecture from it. That is a severe indictment, and I don't think it is completely accurate, but I think it has much validity. I think that we have not developed new conceptual tools in education. I think we have not developed the new tools needed to help us understand the phenomena with which we deal. The front cover of Science last week shows a photograph of blood clotting, magnified twenty-one thousand times; a very precise picture of what is going on physiologically in the human organism. That has come about because of the development of new observational devices in physiology and medicine. We do not have such devices in education. For example, there has been very little progress in observational testing devices in education during the last half-century. Since the Army Alpha Tests in the first World War, which were basically multiple choice, pencil and paper, verbal and timed, we have not been able to break off from that way of observing human behavior. In education, when we try to observe, the tools that we use are half a centruy old and in fact have not been improved very much. I think Druckers' point that there is really only one new tool in the last eight thousand years is too harsh but at the same time it seems to me it points up the crux of the problem. What we need in education are powerful tools; some of those ought to be conceptual. We need powerful theoretical ideas; we need new developments in the theory realm; we need new observational tools, new instructional tools, and new tools of other kinds. I don't know how to go about dealing with that kind of need. I think Drucker has put his finger on a very serious problem. I do not want to believe

merely that we need to do more of what we have already been doing. I think that has been one of our problems for the last fifteen years. I think that if we copied other fields we would be more productive.

I want to share with you and have you try to re-think some of the theoretical ideas that are involved in education with implications for what I think are some of the other operational tools which might be generated. I can't do this fully but I am going to sketch in the outline of my own thinking and in the hope that it may encourage you to reexamine the assumptions upon which your operation functions. I am not going to document this but I think I could. I think in fact the whole concept of public education might have to go down the drain. I don't mean to be an alarmist or an extremist, but I think there is nothing to guarantee that public education will survive. Sometimes when I say that, people say, Don't you believe that education has any strengths? I say yes, but I think our strengths will be our downfall if we are not careful. Strength is not enough. The dinosaur was strong. Strength will not guarantee that we will continue to function. The thing which guarantees the survivability of anything, whether it is an organism or an institution, is not only strength, but the capacity to change. Strength and modifiability; power and the ability to cope; we are very strong on the first and very weak on the second.

I think it is imperative for those of us who have responsibility for education to use our strength but at the same time to build in more coping capacity, more adaptability, more modifiability of the institution with which we work if we want it to survive.

I would like to explore education, using the conventional terms, that we normally use, but comparing what I think it is today with what I think it might become in the years ahead.

I am a generalist; I am going to talk about education from a generalist perspective. Each of you comes from a specialized field. I think you can enrich my argument and sharpen the logic I have been using with the kind of perspective you can bring, but I think the problems that we are facing are general in nature, not special. Let me begin, using the conventional language of education, and let me outline here on the board a little diagram, a conventional model. I would like to talk about it in several different ways. What Drucker is challenging us to do and what the tenor of the time is forcing us to do is to reexamine the curriculum. We need to reexamine the instructional effort involved. We need to reexamine the way in which it is organized. We need to reexamine the evaluation components and other things such as teacher education, supervision and administration. I can't completely fill in that matrix, but I am going to start to sketch in some of it. I am going to begin with a discussion of Silberman's book. He says the schools are mindless. That is an interesting word and I think Silberman has done a real service to education by pressing that point. But technically it is inaccurate. The schools are not without purpose. I think they have direction. When Silberman says they are mindless, he implies that they are drifting along without intention, without purpose. He says we have not, at least in the last twenty to thirty years, paid attention to the purpose of education as we ought to and I think his admonition is a valid one.

Purposes in education are generally derived from three sources. When we determine the direction that education ought to have, the objectives that it ought to pursue, the goals that it ought to aim at, the purposes it ought to strive for, there are three places that we go for information and inspiration.

One of these is what we know about the nature of knowledge, one is what we know about the nature of society, and one is what we know about the nature of the individual.

We have learned a fantastic amount in the last 15 years about the nature of knowledge. We summaraze this sometimes with a rubric, like "the structure of the disciplines." We know that each of the areas of academic inquiry has fundamental facts and ideas that are unique and peculiar to that discipline. We know that the domain of each of the disciplines is relatively discrete, that the aspect of reality that the poet addresses his attention to is different from the aspect of reality that the physiologist looks at. We know also that besides the domains being different and the fundamental facts and ideas and concepts being different, even the history of each discipline is different, and the history of a discipline has a great deal to do with the direction in which the discipline goes. But we also know that the ways of working are different for the different disciplines. The ways of the chemist are different from the ways of the economist; the ways of the economist are different from those of the poet; the ways of the poet are different from those of the historian. The uniqueness of the discipline, the methodology, the history, and the fundamental facts and ideas of each area of academic inquiry represents what I think of as the nature of knowledge, and is one source that we can go to when we want to determine what the purposes of education ought to be.

Another place where we can go is what we know about the nature of society. We can study data from anthropology and sociology, especially cultural expectations, values, norms, how people live and function together, their institutions, mores and custom. In studying these areas, we look at what I think of as the conventional data in sociology and anthropology. In the school situation, for example, we can go the the census bureau and use demographic data to find out in terms of the people who live in the attendance area for a particular school how many of them are black and how many are white; how many are young, how many are old; how many have this much education, how many have that much education; how many have this much money, how many have that much money; how many are Protestant, Catholic and Jewish. We can get all that conventional, sociological data and from that we can determine what the purpose of education ought to be. We can also read Charles Reich's Greening of America, Gailbreth's, The Industrial State, or Margaret Mead's Committment to Culture, for the newer sociological and anthropoligical ideas. The nature of knowledge and the nature of society represent two sources that we can use to determine what the purposes of education ought to be.

The third source is of course, what we know about the nature of the individual. We can turn to disciplines like biology, psychology or physiology. We can go to those people who are knowledgeable about the structure and the function of the individual, studying such things as cognitive process, motivational pattern, or the temperature of the blood at the synapse. We can study all of those things which tell us something about the invididual. We can draw upon that as well as upon the nature of knowledge and the nature of society as a place for determining what the purposes of education ought to be.

Now, we have known for a long time that when we operationalize education and put purposes into action, so to speak, we go to these three sources. We use them in program development and program planning -- often unconsciously -- but nonetheless they are there. Many people assume that we draw upon these three sources equally. We tend to assume that the manifestation of educational

purposes -- the program in action -- is like the seat of a three legged stool. It has one leg rooted firmly in what we know about the nature of knowledge, another rooted firmly in what we know about the nature of society, and the third leg rooted firmly in what we know about the nature of the individual. That is a nice neat idea, but it is wrong; that isn't the way education is built at all. When one looks at educational programs in operation, when one looks at curriculum in practice, inevitably he sees that some of these sources are held to be more important than others. What evidently happens is that people who are responsible for implementing programs, the professionals of the field if you please, use these sources in a hierarchical arrangement in their own mind. Some things are held to be more important than other things and they build a kind of value ranking position -- this is more important than that.

One way for us to hierarchically arrange these things is for us to presume that what we know about the nature of knowledge is of greatest worth, and what we know about the nature of society and the nature of the individual are of secondary importance -- not either/or -- but primary and secondary. Now that kind of arrangement, knowledge being uppermost, society and the individual being secondary, represents a specific philosophical position about education. It represents a philosophical posture -- a value position. It represents an assumption about education. That I call assumption number one. That assumption is the one that characterizes most of the secondary schools, colleges and universities in the United States in which the primary emphasis is on subject matter. What we know about the individual and what we know about the society is given the lesser consideration.

Another way of hierarchically organizing these sources would be what we know about the nature of society is considered to be of greatest worth and what we know about the nature of the individual and the nature of knowledge are held to be of lesser importance -- again, not either/or, but primary and secondary in emphasis. That kind of hierarchical arrangement represents an entirely different value position, an entirely different kind of assumption about what the purposes of education ought to be. I call that assumption number two. It is the one which presumes that we start with the group; other things are given lesser importance. In my judgment this assumption permeates most of the elementary schools in the United States; the concern is primarily for the group. A lot of people in elementary education use terms about the individual, they talk about individual differences and child development. But when one watches what goes on in elementary school, he sees that the primary concern is for teaching kids to be cooperative, to take turns, to be polite, to follow instructions, to put their names in the right-hand corner, etc. Those are basically social considerations and demands. Other things are given less importance.

A third way of organizing these sources in our minds would be to consider what we know about the nature of the individual to be most important. What we know about the nature of society and the nature of knowledge would be given secondary importance. Now that is a different value position; a different philosophical posture about the purpose of education. In my judgment there are very few schools anywhere in the world that are predicated upon that assumption. There are some, and I suspect they are all "way out" schools, like Summerhill, for example. Some of the better British so-called public schools are aimed in that direction. I think there are individual teachers all over the country who base their practice upon this philosophy, but for practical purposes there are very few models we can look at; there are very few places where we can study what education would look like, if in fact, the purposes were hierarchically

arranged so what we know about the individual was considered of greatest importance and what we know about society and the nature of knowledge was considered of lesser importance.

It seems to me that in general, the conventional school, the school we have at the present time, is based upon assumption number one and assumption number two. For all practical purposes those are control assumptions. Assumption number three is basically a growth assumption and that is the one I think we ought to consider trying in years ahead. I do not think it is very widespread at the moment and I do not want to argue against assumptions one and two under certain circumstances. I want to make that clear. It might very well be appropriate to consider, at least in a theoretical sense, the possibility of reconceptualizing the school and the total program in such a way that we honor what we have always said was important -- the individual. In my judgment, assumption number one is basically a vocational assumption; assumption number two is basically a cultural assumption; assumption number three is basically a personal or individual assumption. I want to make the point that assumption number one and assumption number two are strictly control assumptions. If one wants to become a mathematician, for example, I think it is appropriate for the people who have the responsibility to teach him to become a mathematician to operate on the premise of assumption number one and to use mathematics as a discipline to restrict and control his behavior. I think if a person is going to be a mathematician then he has to live according to the discipline and logic of mathematics. I think it is desirable and appropriate for people who have responsibility to teach him to be a mathematician to use all of the powers of mathematics at their command to control his behavior as a mathematician. In the same way, if he wants to become a surgeon, then it is appropriate to use the knowledge from surgery and physiology to control the behavior of the prospective surgeon. I don't like a surgeon operating on me who does not live according to the data of physiology, according to the principles and generalizations that have been developed in the field of surgery. I want my surgeon to be disciplined by the discipline. So I think it is very appropriate to use assumption number one in education under certain circumstances.

For example, if a pilot is going to learn to fly a DC-8 jet, he learns a lot of things. One thing he learns is that to get the DC-8 off the ground and into the air you take it to the end of the runway; you point it down the runway; you push the throttle forward and the plane begins to move. It picks up speed. When the plane reaches the speed of 158 miles per hour, not 159, not 160, not 157 or 156, but 158, the pilot pulls back on the yoke of the plane. When he pulls back on the yoke, the nose goes up. When the nose goes up, the plane begins to leave the ground and start to fly. Now, if at that moment, just as the plane leaves thr ground, just as the air speed is 158 miles per hour, if the right outboard engine goes out, the pilot has seven tenths of a second to detect the fact that the motor quit, and to initiate corrective rudder action with his feet. Furthermore, he gets no visual clues; there aren't any lights that come on or bells that ring or buzzers that sound; there are no stall warnings; there aren't any needles that flicker; he feels it in "the seat of his pants" -- right where he sits down. In seven tenths of a second he feels it right and initiates corrective action with his feet. If he doesn't, the whole damn plane flips over and crashes. That is exactly what happened to the Delta jet that crashed in New Orleans about four years ago and plowed into a motel and killed a bunch of college girls. They think that is what happened to the jet that crashed in Anchorage last winter with 186 service men aboard. Now I fly a lot as a passenger in DC-8 jets. When I get on a DC-8, I want that

guy to know what to do if that right engine goes out. I want the people who are responsible to teach him what he needs to know about aerodynamics and to cram that into his behavior, to control his behavior so that he does exactly the right thing. He only gets one chance and either he does it right, or he and I are both dead. This is why it is very appropriate to operate on the basis of assumption number one, sometimes. The question is whether or not it is an appropriate assumption for the totality of public education. I don't know. If a pilot wants to fly jet transport, he enters into it wholly of his own volition; it is a completely voluntary act. If he wants to be a mathematician, that is a voluntary act. When the individual elects to learn something, it is very appropriate to try to control his behavior. But I am not sure it is appropriate to compel kids to go to school; that is a different set of circumstances. I am not sure that assumption number one is the right one for public education.

Assumption number two is basically a control assumption too. It starts with the group. It says the individual should fit the group. Now I recognize that the extent to which the individual matches the group, the extent to which there are shared feelings or shared values, the extent to which conformity exists, to say it another way, is highly important to a society. In fact, it is the agreement and the conformity that is the cement which holds the society together. And I know that the schools have always had a part to play in the aculturation of kids, to help them learn to fit into their society. That is one of the purposes, but I am not sure it ought to be the major or primary purpose. If it is, we are adopting the basic logic of every totalitarian society that ever existed. The individual exists to serve the state. That is not what our great Nation stands for. But there is an awful lot of talk like that around. For example, I guess we are over the hump now but we weren't over it two or three years ago when school people throughout the country were concerned about how long kids' hair was. The concern for hair length of students is a social concern. I don't know of any data that suggests there is a correlation between hair length and achievement in school. I will predict that if there is such a correlation, it is negative. But the point is, when school people got up tight about how long a kid's hair ought to be in school, their concern was a social, not an academic or personal consideration.

I think we ought to consider in this country, right now, the possibility of trying to build a new and different kind of educational operation based on assumption number three -- the individual. We ought to know what we know about the individual in order to help him grow, not to control his behavior, unless he wants to control it so that he can be a pilot, mathematician, farmer, poet, or something else. The essence of public education, it seems to me, is the responsibility to foster the growth of the individual. We say things like that, but in actual practice we have not moved in that direction.

For example, it is very easy to figure out what curriculum ought to be employed if one starts with assumption number one. If a student wants to become a mathematician, then he has to study mathematics. If he wants to be a poet, plumber, farmer, or physicist, then he has to study the appropriate data. It is obvious what subject matter is essential from assumption number one. It is equally obvious what subject matter is essential from assumption number two. If a child is to grow up to be a good American then he has to study something about America. He has to know our language, our culture, how our government is put together and how it functions, our economic system, and the history of our country. It is logical to ask: What is essential under assumption number three? What does every individual absolutely have to know? I don't know but

I think the question is a legitimate one. It is easy for me to work with people in the field of curriculum and to deal with curriculum questions under assumption number one and assumption number two. But I think there is something going on in America today that suggests that there is something wrong with those assumptions. For example, many of the kids who have been raising hell the last two or three years are about twenty or twenty-one years old. Roughly, they are college sophomores. They entered school when they were six, fourteen years ago. Fourteen from 1971 is 1957. What happened in 1957? Much of the great reform movement in education started in 1957 with the advent of Sputnik. Doesn't it strike you as at least a little incongruous? The kids who are now raising hell are the very ones who had the benefits of all this wonderful mathematics, all this marvelous science, all this great social studies methodology. They have had the innovative thinking and organizational strategies. They are the very students who have had the fruit of all this stuff, and they are chucking it. They are saying, take that damn stuff away; I don't want it. They are rejecting the educational diet that we are making, at least a lot of them are. I am uncomfortable thinking that the way in which we exerted our greatest effort in the last fifteen years was based on assumption number one. Apparently that is not where the problems are nor where the answers lie. I think we need to consider the possibility of pressing for assumption number three.

Let me talk a little more about assumption number three. It seems to me that if I value the individual, and if I think about how education ought to value the individual, what precisely is it that I am valuing about the individual? When I think about the assumptions behind assumptions, it seems to me that there is only one thing about the individual that has value, and that is life itself. What is life worth? I don't think mathematics is worthwhile; I don't think physical education is worthwhile; I don't think physics is worthwhile; I don't think biology is worthwhile; I think life is worthwhile. Life has value and life is an individual phenomenon. Life is not a characteristic of groups, nor is it a characteristic of academic discipline. Life is a characteristic of individuals. I think life has value. If in fact one accepts that assumption, if life has value, then it seems to me that what we do in schools ought to approach the problem of nurturing life, fostering life. A lot of people who work in any society are concerned with life. The nutritionist and the physiologist are concerned with physical life, and we in education are concerned with what we think of as intellectual or emotional life. People in fields like nutrition, physiology, biology and medicine have learned a great deal about the life process. It seems to me that it might be useful to try to understand how they have approached their problem, for clues about how we might approach our problem. As I see it, people in those fields have learned over the years to ask a certain series of questions.

They have asked about five questions in general. One question is, What is essential? What is essential in order to maintain physical life? What ingredients, what substances, what realities are absolutely necessary in order to maintain physical life? For example, are hamburgers essential? Are lima beans, Coca Cola or bourbon essential? Obviously none of these things are essential, but some things are. If I don't have water, I will die; if I don't have protein, I will die; if I don't have oxygen, I will die. Without those things life ceases to be. So, although none of the first things I mentioned are essential, some of the ingredients within them are imperative if life is to continue. The first question that people in those fields have asked is, What ingredients, what substances are absolutely essential in order to maintain physical life?

The second question they have asked is, How much is essential? How much oxygen, how much water, how much protein? I absolutely have to have water or I will die. But there is both an upper and lower limit to the water quantity question. My body cannot handle fifty gallons of water a day. I can't process or cope with that much. I cannot cope with twenty gallons of water a day, or ten gallons a day. Probably, if I had to, I could cope with a gallon or two, or maybe three. I probably could get by on as little as a quart or maybe a pint of water, at least for a while, but I could not remain alive on much less. So, the second question is, How much is essential?

The third question is, Where are these essential ingredients found in usable form? For example, I have to have iron to survive. There is iron in the end of a pencil. I can chew on the end of a pencil all day though and it won't help. The iron there isn't available to me in usable form. The third question that people working fields such as biology, physiology and nutrition have asked is, Where are these essential ingredients found in a usable form?

The fourth question is, How much of any essential ingredient is present within the parameters of any given unit. For example, how much iron is included in a pound of calf's liver or two tablespoons of Geritol? How much vitamin A is there in a glass of milk or a glass of orange juice? How much of whatever is required is present within the limits of the material to be consumed? There is enough iron in that pencil to last me for a long time, and I have got to have iron or I will die. But although that is plenty of iron to last me a long time, the quantity and availability questions have not been resolved satisfactorily. This fourth question: How much is present within the parameters of any unit that is available to me?

The fifth question is, Under what conditions will the ingestion of these ingredients be most conducive to maintaining and perpetrating my physical life? For example, I have to have oxygen in order to live. But I have to have that oxygen under certain conditions. The conditions are basically temporal. I have to have oxygen available in a very steady state, and if I am deprived of it for a couple of minutes all the oxygen in the world won't help me. Oxygen has to be available under certain spatial and temporal conditions, under certain circumstances, to fulfill my need to survive, to maintain my physical life. The fifth question is, Under what conditions will the ingestion of these ingredients be most conducive to the maintenance of physical life?

I think these five questions are provocative for people in education. If we are concerned with the perpetration of life itself, in all of its ramifications and all its manifestations, physical, intellectual, emotional and otherwise, it seems to me that we might ask the same kind of questions about education. One might ask, What is essential, what facts, what concepts are absolutely necessary in order to maintain intellectual and emotional richness in the personal life of the individual? I don't know. I think many people in physical education throw a lot of knowledge at kids that they think would help the individual. I expect some of that is appropriate. But what facts are essential? Do I have to know my parts of speech? I have written three books; published 150 articles; I am editor of a journal and have served as editor of our magazines and I still do not know my parts of speech. I am not kidding. I do not know them. Any English teacher who says you have to know the parts of speech is crazy. You don't have to know your parts of speech unless you are an English teacher. English teachers are the only ones who do know them. They are the only ones who know how to diagram sentences. None of you know how to diagram a sentence.

But if you are in the seventh grade you are supposed to know it because it is considered essential. That is nonsense. Do you know why you don't split infinitives? You don't split infinitives because you didn't split infinitives in Latin. But in Latin, an infinitive was one word, not two words, so you couldn't split them. We borrowed that rule from Latin and followed it in English and we teach kids you shouldn't split an infinitive, based on something which is not even a literal translation. Ridiculous! We teach that it is all right to split an infinitive if you are talking, but not if you are writing. What is essential? What facts are essential? Do I have to know how to solve a quadratic equation? Do I have to know that the First Amendment guarantees freedom of speech, press, religion, assembly, petition? Do I have to know these things in order to survive? I do not know what facts I absolutely have to know; I wish I did. I wish I knew what was essential. We know that something is probably essential. There are some studies of stimulus deprivation that suggest that if an organism is deprived of all stimulation, it withers and ultimately will die. So I don't think there is any question that something, some kind of input is essential, but I don't know what it is.

The second question is, How much is essential? I don't know that either. Every time we require a course, we act as if we know both what is essential and how much is essential. I wish we had a better basis than we have. I am sure that in the field of intellectual diet, in the field of curriculum input, food for thought, or whatever you want to call it, there are upper and lower limits. There is no doubt, for example, that we can throw so much stuff at kids, so much information, so much input that we create a kind of cognitive surfeit, or cognitive indigestion. One can throw things at people so fast that ultimately they can't handle them. They hide or run away; they cannot cope with it. When a human being is cut off from stimulation the intellect deteriorates. Dullness is an end result as well as something an individual is born with. The individual has been deprived of certain kinds of stimulation and certainly the kind of work that James Hunt and others are doing would suggest that, if we want to, we can provide a cognitive diet that will raise IQ phenomenally. Some people suggest that if we wanted to, we could raise the average IQ in the United States by 30 points in the next thirty years, so that the average level of IQ would be 130. We don't want to use our resources for that, but the creation of high or low intelligences is probably, at least in part, a function of the availability of stimuli in certain quantities. But how much is essential? I wish we knew that. People working in fields like nutrition and so forth spend tremendous amounts of time trying to find out how much is essential. You know that if an individual does not have protein he will die. That is what happened in Biafra. The people of Biafra had a lot of things but they did not have protein. If a person is cut from an essential ingredient he will ide. If people are cut off educationally from essential ingredients they will probably die. But still, we do not know what is essential.

Where are these ingredients found in usable form? Now we think we know that. We think that a science film, a physical education experience, or a mathematics textbook has certain kinds of concepts. We think we know something about where those concepts are, but we really do not know. For example, we don't know generally what the content is of a field trip to the fire house, or what is the content of an hour's conuseling session. We think that they are valuable but we really do not know what the content is.

The fourth question is, How much is contained within the given unit? We have very little idea. In fact, if I were asked how many concepts, how many

generalizations there are in this lecture, I would not know. I know more about the calories and carbohydrates in a baked potato or soda cracker. I know more about how many units of vitamin A there are in a glass of milk than I know about the content of the field I deal with myself. Most people are more knowedgeable about quantity and where things are located than they are in their own discipline. We do not know the content of content. We need a kind of content analysis of our own field so that we can find out what is included and then be able to prescribe it affectively.

When we get the fifth question, that is, Under what conditions are things supposedly best? That is where we think we shine. We think that praise is better than reproof, or that this ought to come first and that ought to come second. Why else do we have the notion of prerequisites, for example, unless we think that this ought to come first and that second, or that we ought to have so much every so many hours? Those are condition questions, temporal questions, spacial questions. We really do not know much about it at all.

I have tried to share with you both the frustration which I sense personally, and at the same time to explore a way of viewing education which might be provocative and open up things. I do not know if it is possible for people like you and me to examine our own assumptions. I do not know whether it is possible for us to get inside our own behavior and to think about what the purpose of education really ought to be, what facts really are essential, what instructional methodology really is most appropriate, what organizational schemes really are most effective. The anthropologist points out that all individuals are like all other individuals in some respects, like some other individuals in other respects, and like no other individual in certain respects. For example, every individual is born, has a heart, lungs, etc., and eventually dies. He is like all other human beings in that respect. But in other respects every individual is like only some other human beings. Men are like other men, women are like other women. So we are like some other people in some respects. Yet each individual is unique in certain respects. Nobody has a genetic pattern like mine; nobody has a genetic pattern like yours; nobody has my past experience; nobody has your past experience. In those things that are crucial to education, the experiential background, the genetic background, the genetic predisposition -- every individual is unique in those.

Now it seems to me that we ought to know something about the uniqueness of the individual and then be able to operationalize accordingly. If there is anything evident in the reform efforts of the last fifteen years, it is that we have ignored the fact that individuals are different. We have done that when trying to adapt group situations to individual learning problems. We threw out the old math and brought in the new. We threw out the old way of teaching reading and brought the new way of teaching reading in. When we did that what we did was to chuck one group way of doing things and substitute another group way of doing things. But hundreds and hundreds of studies show that none of those new ways do better than the old way. The new math does not teach kids math better than the old math; the new way of teaching foreign language does not teach kids any better than the old way; the new way of teaching reading does not teach better than the old way. The reason is because individuals are different. Some people learn better by the new way and some people learn better by the old way. Some people learn better when ideas are sequenced inductively; other people learn better when ideas are sequenced deductively. Some people learn better vicariously; other people learn better directly.

There is no way of doing things that is best for all people, because people are different. People in special education ought to know that. People who know that ought to be able to communicate it to the rest of us; people are different. Because people are different, there is no one way of doing anything which is best for all people. God himself, if he was a teacher or curriculum director, could not find a single way of doing anything that would be best for all people. If God could not find it, I do not know why we keep trying. I do not know why we get so hung up on etiology: This is the way to do it; not that way, this way! There is no one way. There never will be because people are different. Somehow or other we have to understand the uniqueness of the individual, and then we have to try, if we can, to build a program which will foster the growth of the individual. We have to pay some attention to acculturation; we have to pay some attention to the vocational needs, but it seems to me we ought to consider the individual.

I think we need to rethink the totalitary of education. These are very tough times. Part of the reason they are tough is because we do not even recognize how difficult they are. We recognize that we have financial problems, political problems; but what we really have are survival problems. We need to generate the most powerful concepts, the most powerful tools, the most powerful observation devices we are able to generate. I think people in fields like physical education and recreation are especially helpful in that respect because they come closer to dealing with the individual than the people in fields like English or mathematics. I heard Lawrence Cubie say one time that the people who are the most hopeful people in medicine are the pathologists. The pathologist hopes that by studying disease, he can understand what healthy tissue is like, to be able to help the physician in his preventive role. People in special education can be very helpful to people in regular education in the same way. The problem concerns purposes and curriculum and organization. I don't know if we are going to solve the problem or not. To quote that great philosopher, Pogo, "We have met the enemy, and he is us." I think that the greatest barrier to improvement in education are those of us who live in and work in it. The barrier is not Congress or the state legislature, or parents; the barrier is us. We have to lift ourselves by our own boot straps. We have to draw upon all the talents we have. We have to generate a whole different kind of research, a whole different kind of theory, a whole different kind of conceptualization of what education could become. I don't know whether we can do it or not, but I hope we can try.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II

# TRAINING PERSPECTIVES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION PHYSICAL EDUCATION RECREATION

# Training Perspectives -- What's Happening and What Should Be Happening in Special Education

Dr. James D. Beaber
Associate Professor
Faculty for Exceptional Children
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

We recognize that children differ, we also recognize that there is a great deal of commonality in their abilities to gain knowledge and apply it in the daily activities of our society. The need and desire to transmit and perpetuate our society through planned education has, in the United States, resulted in a broad program of public schooling wherein every child can be provided with a basic education. This philosophy has made our country one of the most progressive and literate in the history of civilization.

While mass education is commendable, we have found that it requires that children progress in an orderly or graded fashion through the system. However, there are groups of children who require more individualized attention because of physical, mental, social emotional or sensory disabilities. These children need special attention in their learning programs if they are to achieve their maximum potential development. Adaptive curriculums and special methods of teaching the handicapped has resulted in particular programs of teacher preparation directed primarily at this population. Keep in mind that estimates of 10 to 15 percent of our school age children are handicapped to such an extent that they need such specialized educational programming.

While the history of programs for the handicapped is quite long, the history of preparation of teachers to work directly with the handicapped in programs fashioned for their particular needs, only has a history of about 50 years in this country.

In our country, education is constitutionally the responsibility of the state. That is, each state has provisions which guarantee each child the right to a free public school education. When we consider the child who has a physical handicap or the child who cannot see or hear, or the child who does not have the mental or emotional ability to participate in learning situations in competition with "normal" children, we begin to see the problem and magnitude related to the aforementioned legal responsibility of the state for providing an education for all children.

Let's take a look at the child we are takking about. This is a child who has, in the past, been neglected or even denied a public school education on the basis of his physical or mental handicap. The schools and teachers simply were not prepared to handle gross discrepencies in a classroom learning situation. As a result of a frequent policy of exclusion of the handicapped child from schools, parents of the handicapped began to get together in their common concern, i.e., their child could not function in public schools. The parent groups began to approach their legislators and school officials with first the plea and then the demand of, "Why can't my child go to school? I pay taxes the same as anyone else." As a result of this collective effort, state legislators began to take action and replied, "All right. We will mandate, we will make provisions for your child assuring him the right to attend the public schools."

With this legal mandate, which followed from state to state, the question now was: Who is to teach these special children? Regular classroom teachers for the most part had indicated their lack of interest in doing so. At the time, there were very few colleges that had programs or faculty ready to prepare teachers of the handicapped. Also, even though realizing that they needed special programming, the special programming curriculum was not very clearly defined. We knew they could not compete with the normal, yet knew they could function well on their own level. Development of a teacher preparation program was vital and was given increased national scope through the U.S. Office of Education wherein programs were designed to stimulate research into the functional ability of the handicapped child leading to preparation of a teacher to develop the greatest possible potential of the child within the public school setting.

For the most part, our model for training teachers of the handicapped evolved through what we call the 'group process'. It went something like this: "Let's sit down and determine what it is that good teachers of the handicapped child should know that is different or special." As a base, the teacher should first know how to teach normal children and hence, should have the basic teacher education program. Then they should learn about the handicapping condition or the 'nature and needs' of the handicapped child. How then do we determine and identify a managable body of knowledge in this area? Logically, when we talk about the nature and needs of the handicapped, we should be talking about their psychological or learning nature, i.e., how he thinks and reacts to his handicap and how this affects his ability to adjust and to learn. Also, what are their differing physiological and sensory needs that should be considered? Then, what does this special child need educationally that other children do not need? For example, the mentally retarded child will not be able to read, understand, or enjoy Shakespeare, but he does have the ability to read sufficiently to gain specific knowledge that will enable him to lead a functional life with much independence rather than be a ward of the state in a total care institutional setting. This can be accomplished if he has the benefit of an education curriculum designed for him rather than for all children and a teacher who has been prepared to understand, manage and individualize instruction. In other words, he needs a functional education that will prepare him to live as a participating member of society with his handicap being minimized and a teacher to help him achieve this potential.

The problem of how to prepare teachers of handicapped children is, to an extent, further complicated by the nature of teacher certification. Each state has independently attempted to set specific standards of teacher certification. As a result, few states have required the same program of academic study, preparation and experiences for certification of their special education teachers. My own background is typical of a teacher who, for one reason or another, moves from one state to another. In moving from the state where I originally went to college, I found that I lacked a specific course in teaching arts and crafts to the mentally retarded. Two years later I moved again, and this time I found that I lacked an entirely different course certification requirement.

A number of years ago, I sat in on a conference which involved fourteen southern states. The conference was an attempt to set up standards of teacher preparation and certification that would allow a teacher to move from state to state and still retain certification. Again, the problem was to agree on what specific courses or sequence of courses would best be taken. Most of these relate to the classics of how to teach basic skill subjects with little attention

to the development of social, emotional, physical or recreational skills necessary for adequate adjustment to our society and particularly necessary to the exceptional child who has a far greater adjustment to make in that even simple coordination is often lacking in his physical makeup so that he must be taught, for example, the way to throw a ball or catch a ball rather than have it a natural ability. Typically the teacher of the handicapped children in public school settings has little specific preparation in the field of physical education programs for children. They do, however, usually in their student teaching experience, find that they are responsible for the total education program for their class. This includes any physical education activity because, also typical is the fact that often the physical education teachers feel they are inadequately prepared to work or teach these children and will defer to the special education teacher.

It is a question in my mind as to whether or not we are preparing our future teachers to cope with the reality of teaching, particularly in regard to the handicapped child. Incident studies show 10 to 15 percent of all children entering the public schools have a disability that sets them apart from other children. Many of these children will be assigned to special classes with specially trained teachers, many will be in regular classes. I feel that there is a need for all teachers of children, including physical educators, to have some basic knowledge and understanding of the needs of the handicapped. With the high percentage quoted, why should not all prospective teachers have a basic course that deals with the differing handicapping conditions of these children. We should provide a program of teacher preparation, again for all prospective teachers, that goes beyond methods of teaching basic scholastic subjects and will train the teacher to recognize specific needs and be able to develop specific curriculums to meet these needs.

When I was teaching, I was not knowledgeable about the child with a special health problem, epilepsy. I had received little preparation on how to cope with a postpolio, an asthmatic, a seriously socially withdrawn child, a child who was so threatened by school demands that he was truant with great frequency, a retarded child who was unable to cope with the social stigma of his retardation and wanted to participate in the regular school program. I had all of these types of children in my classroom that first year. Not a typical situation but most teachers will have to deal with these problems at some time in their teaching careers, probably within the regular classroom, and should have at least the basic knowledge to recognize that this child does need special programming in order to benefit from the school setting.

The future program for preparing teachers of the handicapped looks quite bright. We now have the prospect of reviewing the programs which developed out of expediency and need rather than long careful planning. I believe we are now ready to objectively re-evaluate our programs as professional educators who truly believe in the educational development of the "whole child" and of all children. We have met the demand for supplying educated people to man the classroom; now we must develop our preparation programs around models that produce quality.

In our present programs for preparing teachers of the handicapped, we have given a great deal of emphasis to the courses required and their sequencing. Very little emphasis has been placed on direct contact with children. The prospective teacher is given all of his prescribed course of academic study after which he has a period of direct interaction with children. There is presently

a developing program here at the University to get the freshman or sophomore student exposed to what a career in teaching actually encompasses so that the student who goes into teaching solely for lack of any real interest in anything else is no longer going to find it automatic to take a degree in education and end up a half-hearted teacher. We are taking a very objective look at prospective teachers in an effort to train more truly qualified people.

The challenge of teacher-education institutions today is not the number of teachers we can turn out but rather the quality of teachers and the increased competency of teachers. To meet this challenge of preparing a better qualified teacher, I believe we are going to have to develop a new model whereby we become less concerned about the number and title of courses taken but rather the comprehensive nature of the public school teacher's role and how we can best prepare them to meet this role. We need a program that draws on the resources of our total University; a program involving interdisciplinary team teaching with earlier and progressively more direct involvement in the teaching process itself.

The future prospect in preparing teachers of the handicapped is going to relate to the type of activities and professional change going on today, here, in our University. We are going to see better criteria set in the selection of future teachers; more and more cooperation among related areas within the University; earlier experiences with children, where classroom instruction parallels functional application; a critique of knowledges gained where they can be applied to children rather than to a pop quiz in the lecture hall.

I am suggesting that the conference today is indicative of a new day and a new approach to the training of teachers of handicapped children. There has been a general restlessness and move among educators across the nation to look for and develop a broad interdisciplinary approach to the preparation of teachers of the handicapped. The interdisciplinary approach is predicated on the assumption that no specific interest area, whether it be the medical doctor, the subject matter oriented teacher, or the physical educator, can alone provide for the varied needs of full educational programming for the handicapped child. Specialists from many professional disciplines having varied knowledges of physical, psychological, social, emotional, and educational needs of children, are finding that they must develop ways of communicating among themselves so that better, broader, more coordinated curriculums can be devised. Because of the classical demands of a college education, a basic program of professional preparation and specific courses, we have had little opportunity to provide students with a broad understanding of individual needs and yet we know that our special education teacher must have this knowledge because of the nature of the handicapped child.

Research and expanded knowledges in all aspects of education of the handicapped is providing us with a broader base of knowledge. Modern technology allows us to rapidly bring these findings together through development of information retrieval systems and instructional materials centers. These resource centers are available to all teachers and follow the interdisciplinary plan.

Parents of all children are asking teachers and schools to show that they are doing the job of educating their children. The teacher must become more accountable for the job she is doing, for what she is teaching, and what the product of her instruction can do. Legislation alone cannot guarantee a solid core of instruction; the individual teacher must be better prepared to meet the demands of our society today.

We are moving away from the "special class" concept where children are grouped according to disability or handicapping condition rather than learning needs. The special class and self-contained classroom for the handicapped will fade away. First we teachers of the handicapped will probably need to be prepared to meet the particular needs of groups of handicapped children but will then begin to function as a resource to the total school program so that the handicapped child will receive much of his schooling with other children and meet with the special teacher only when learning needs specifically related to his exceptionality requires specialized teaching techniques.

We will, someday, have no need for a conference such as this, not on a special day, in a special place, because we will, as educators in all fields of educational specialization, be working together through continued exchange of ideas and knowledges towards an integrated full program of education and teacher preparation.

## Training Perspectives -- What's Happening and What Should Be Happening in Physical Education and Recreation

Julian U. Stein, Consultant
Programs for the Handicapped
American Association for Health
Physical Education, and Recreation
Washington, D.C.

Several years ago I was fortunate to hear a presentation by John Ferve, a vice-president of TWA, talk about growth and progress in undeveloped countries, the bush countries, as he put it. He said one thing which never ceased to amaze him was how individuals only one generation from the bush could be taught to run jet airlines and have perfect safety records, to become engineers, and to design computers. They were involved and successful in highly technical, complex, and sophisticated professions. He wondered if this wasn't contrary to the entire concept of civilization; hadn't it taken generations and generations for the civilized world to gain this knowledge, obtain these skills, and apply those competencies? Finally, the obvious emerged. Whether a child is born in the bush country or in a 'civilized,' modern metropolitan-urban area, every baby comes into the world in the same way -- uncivilized. When opportunities and advantages of civilization are provided, even those from the bush can be reached and the technical, complex, and sophisticated lessons of man learned in one generation. We are somewhat in the same way in professional preparation and training in physical education and recreation for impaired, disabled, and handicapped. Individuals and groups have been involved in physical education and recreation programs in these areas and for these populations for years. Unfortunately today too many of us are spinning our wheels, rehashing the same old thing, going over the same territory, repeating the past, making the same mistakes, using the same trial and error methods, and experiencing the same frustrations instead of using and benefiting from experiences of others so as to move forward, progress, and move more rapidly. Many say a great teacher is one who places students at his feet and imparts knowledge to them -- this is not the great teacher at all! The great teacher is one who raises students to his shoulders and motivates, stimulates, encourages, and challenges them to project further and to have even greater vision than the teacher. We need to consider and apply this concept and philosophy so as to move forward, not spin our wheels or simply devise programs, activities and projects that look backwards and are designed for 1950's and '60's rather than the '70's and '80's.

Exciting things are going on in training and professional preparation in these areas; success stories need to be related and promising practices presented However, none of these are offered as <u>the</u> way, because as Dr. Jack Frymier indicated this morning, there is no <u>one</u> way to guarantee success in anything. As soon as we start looking for that one way -- Shangri-la or Utopia -- we immediately move the third level back to the first level, as Dr. Frymier's discussion and presentation indicated this morning. We want to move more to the third level in professional preparation programs in physical education and recreation programs for impaired, disabled, and handicapped. As soon as we start looking for one way to prepare all persons in these areas we immediately negate the very principle of individual differences, therefore, the following are not presented

with any intent or implication that they will be successful in your state, community, or area, but rather with the idea that here are some things that have been successful for certain people and specific groups in meeting physical education and/or recreation training needs for persons involved in programs at all levels for impaired, disabled, and handicapped. They are designed to stimulate your inventiveness, your resourcefulness, to make you more innovative, creative, and original, and to provide you a shoulder from which to spring.

A major point of emphasis and topic for discussion in educational circles today is the role of the para-professional, volunteer, aide, or whatever other term used to describe persons who participate in programs without four year college training. For years Meridian, Mississippi, has had an outstanding program for junior and community college students who actually conduct physical education programs for mentally retarded in public schools at all levels. These students receive intensified and in depth instruction about the whys, wherefores, and hows of physical education and recreation programs and activities for mentally retarded. This program has a special supervisor, in addition to the city supervisor for physical education, who does nothing but work with these junior/community college students. In addition to on spot program supervision, in-service seminar types of sessions are held regularly. Students receive individual counseling and guidance about their role of teaching physical education to mentally retarded and handicapped youngsters with ongoing supervision, professional leadership, and specialized assistance.

An outstanding in-service program is being implemented in Prince George's County, Maryland. A physical education supervisor does nothing but work with special education classroom teachers and elementary level physical education teachers responsible for special groups and classes. He provides many services including bibliographies, books, newsletters, audio-visual materials, and other resources; he does demonstration teaching; he conducts regular in-service programs during release time in which teachers get involved and participate in activities they are going to teach. Teachers put on pants suits, slacks or hot pants, and participate in a variety of activities that are a part of the program. The supervisor does not superimpose what he thinks teachers should be doing; he obtains direct input and feedback from them to determine activities, needs, concerns, problems, priorities, and specifics to be emphasized in their classes.

Many colleges and universities have developmental clinic programs. Some clinics are designed to provide practical experiences and opportunities for students in specific professional preparation courses and curriculas; however many clinics are not related to curriculum. Individuals taking courses or sequences in many different areas -- physical education, special education, recreation, psychology, home economics, nursing, education, sociology -- are often involved in these clinics to obtain practical experience. A number of clinics also use volunteers who simply want to be involved in the program. The grand-daddy of these programs is Warren Johnson's Children's Physical Development Clinic at the University of Maryland; a film depicting activities, and training is available from Dr. Johnson at University of Maryland. Sessions are held before each clinic program for clinicians to discuss students with whom they are going to be working, activities, techniques, methods, procedures, and goals for the day. At the end of each day a post-session is conducted to evaluate progress, determine to what degree goals were achieved, report and make recommendations about each child, discuss problems encountered, and for other interchange about youngsters and their programs. Guidance and direction are available from representatives of other departments and disciplines involved in

the program as well as Dr. Johnson and other members of the College of Health, Physical Education and Recreation. Many of Dr. Johnson's students have carried the concepts of this program to their own campuses; the number is too numerous to mention. Similar programs can be found border-to border, coast-to coast and sponsored by parent groups, civic associations, service organizations, public schools, recreation departments as well as colleges and universities.

Orrin Marx, University of Iowa Hospital School (Iowa City), is an example of an individual doing an outstanding job with both undergraduate and graduate students in physical education. Practical field opportunities, research investigations, seminar experiences, and personalized practical projects have been a part of this program for over 15 years; many of these students have gone to all areas of teaching and service in adapted physical education.

Macomb Intermediate School District (Michigan) has just received a three year Title III Elementary Secondary Education Act Grant dealing with outdoor education for the handicapped. An important part of this project involves training classroom teachers to work in and to become effective teachers in outdoor education. Each year a number of projects prepare teachers to participate in outdoor education activities and programs; Michigan has been a leader in promoting these efforts.

Each year a training project for teachers in outdoor education is held at Higgins Lake; sessions emphasizing impaired, disabled, and handicapped have been included for the last several years. This year twenty-nine teachers from Macomb Intermediate School District participated in the Higgins Lake program so they could become knowledgeable, skilled, and competent in outdoor education themselves as preparation for implementing outdoor education programs under the recently awarded Title III grant. Battle Creek, Michigan has incorporated in-service activities into its regularly scheduled outdoor education programs for all students, including handicapped. For example, two years ago physical education and special education teachers from all over Michigan spent a week with mentally retarded and handicapped youngsters from Battle Creek Public Schools who were participating in outdoor education activities. These teachers had opportunities to work with youngsters, receive expert instruction in outdoor education activities and methods, participate in pertinent seminars, discuss mutual problems and concerns, and to experience living in the out-of-doors themselves.

A unique program was funded under a Title I Higher Education Project at Iowa State University a couple of years ago. In the initial phase of the project a three day workshop focusing on practical, how to do it, functional activities, methods, techniques, and procedures was held. Content of the workshop emphasized kinds of things all practitioners are constantly seeking; some activities could be used in their own classrooms the next day; others were designed to motivate, stimulate, challenge, and encourage them to adapt, modify, and innovate. For the rest of the year staff at Iowa State was available on a consultant basis to schools, residential facilities, day care centers, recreation departments, and other participating groups to follow up the workshop and to help evaluate, enrich, even introduce physical education and recreation programs for mentally retarded. They expected 100 participants and over 350 attended. This approach can be applied to all areas of physical education and recreation for impaired, disabled, and handicapped.

Several interesting programs have been held in Arkansas during the last year. One was initiated by psychology and research personnel at Hot Springs Rehabilitation Center who felt a need for more knowledge, information, and understanding of the role of physical education and recreation in the total rehabilitation program. Participants were not just from Arkansas but came from similar centers in Virginia, California, New York, Missouri, and many points between. This program was designed to acquaint different personnel from rehabilitation centers with the role of recreation and physical activity in the total rehabilitation process, and to motivate them to action.

Recently selected staff members from all community service centers (day care and activity centers) and children's colonies (residential facilities) participated in a special two day workshop at Arkansas Children's Colony in Conway. Representatives of these groups planned this two day workshop which emphasized functional, how to do it, and practical aspects of physical education, recreation, and aquatic programs. Sessions were videotaped for use and follow-up at centers, colonies, in other schools and by any interested group or agency. Each of the five regional representatives responsible for centers and colonies throughout the state participated in the workshop; they are assisting in implementation and follow up of workshop activities, recommendations, and methods.

Under sponsorship of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation in Arkansas, a survey was conducted to determine what was being done for impaired, disabled, and handicapped in recreation in the state, and to plan better ways of meeting their recreational needs. A few other states conducted similar surveys as part of comprehensive mental retardation planning activities.

Many residential facilities have shown increasing interest, concern, and involvement in physical education and recreation. Workshops at residential facilities throughout Texas, in Winfield, Kansas; Rome, New York; Brainerd, Faribault, and Cambridge, Minnesota; Ellisville, Mississippi; and Columbus, Ohio, to name a few, have been conducted during the last year or so. Many of these workshops provide know how and direction to ward attendants and cottage or ward parents so they can introduce and conduct physical and recreation activities.

Recent meetings sponsored by the Texas Association for Retarded Children, funded under the Developmental Disabilities Act, involved representatives from all parts of Texas. Participants represented (1) colleges and universities, (2) public education, (3) mental health-mental retardation boards, (4) public schools, and (5) community recreation departments and park boards. The mission of participants was to work together, to communicate, and to develop interagency and multi-disciplinary approaches throughout Texas in all aspects of physical education and recreation programs for impaired, disabled, and handicapped. Training and professional preparation programs and activities were major considerations in these meetings and will receive high priority in follow-up projects and future meetings. The tenth annual workshop on physical education, recreation and aquatics for the handicapped will be sponsored by the Longview, Washington, YMCA next February (1972); this is the longest consecutive series of workshops for personnel working with the handicapped in the country. Every attempt has been made since 1963 to involve all agencies and individuals representing various organizations and groups sponsoring programs of this type for the handicapped.

Louisiana State University, New Orleans, has a unique in-service approach for special education and physical education teachers. New Orleans LSUNO

physical education staff volunteered to work with teachers and provide Saturday in-service programs on activities and topics specified by special educators and/or physical educators. Specialized workshops in movement exploration, tumbling, gymnastics, low organized games, rhythms, physical fitness activities, and in specific sports have been conducted. Participating teachers have opportunities actually to work with youngsters of all ages and with various handicapping conditions. Even though most of these teachers work with kids day in and day out, many see them in a different light through these new activities. This is a popular program in which LSUNO staff volunteers and teachers participate according to their interests and needs.

The Children's Rehabilitation Center, University of Virginia (Charlottesville), sponsors two interesting programs. A one week inter-disciplinary graduate seminar focuses on adapted physical education and therapeutic recreation for youngsters with all handicapping conditions. A summer camp for children with respiratory problems -- asthma, cystic fibrosis, and other types of chronic respiratory problems -- provides services to these youngsters in a camping situation. Students from colleges, universities, and from different agencies serve as camp staff. Each student has opportunities for new experiences, to see children in different ways, to learn about growth and development first hand, to obtain new insights about sequences and progressions of motor activities, and to develop broader understanding and deeper appreciation of children with respiratory conditions.

Barn storming workshops have been successful in several states (Hawaii, Mississippi, Alabama). An individual or team goes into a state and conducts one day drive-in workshops in population centers throughout the state -- the mountain is taken to Mohammed. In these days of tight budgets and austerity, no stone can be left unturned in providing economical in-service activities in or near home base. Another mobile approach has been effective and successful in Kentucky. A special mobile unit in physical education and recreation for retarded and handicapped operates through Kentucky Association for Retarded Children under a grant from Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. Major activities of this unit have included one, two, three day workshops in communities, at schools, for residential facilities, and in day care centers, at colleges/universities, and for other groups interested in these programs. The special van also serves as a mobile resource center with books, articles, pamphlets, brochures, equipment, supplies, and other physical education-recreation program materials. This provides still another important dimension to workshops, brings new materials to participants, and gives them an opportunity to see what is available and appropriate for their programs.

Oklahoma Association for Retarded Children sponsored a very successful workshop in conjunction with its state convention last April. Many different groups, organizations, associations, and agencies are involved in physical education and recreation programs for impaired disabled, and handicapped, and offer a variety of training and in-service activities for members, staff, and other interested persons. Obviously, many other groups and their programs could be mentioned and discussed.

In what directions should we be moving? Is it dangerous and limiting to say or imply there are directions we should move because of connotations that one, two, or three approaches answer all questions and solve everyone's problems? As emphasized this morning, we must not only think in terms of individualizing at the program level, but just as appropriate and important to individualize

at the training level. Often the individuality of those with whom we work is emphasized. Too often we forget about or neglect the individuality of teachers, leaders and specialists; broad generalizations about them and their training is no more justified than at program level. This then represents movement from first and second levels to the third level as discussed this morning.

Three groups must be considered relative to training. First, personnel now in the field. It is interesting to note that many physical educators moving into adapted physical education and other aspects of programs for handicapped are individuals with anywhere from five to fifteen or twenty years experience with normal kids. Secondly, we have to consider students who have not yet matriculated into professional preparation programs. Some students will enter these programs with no previous experience whatsoever with the handicapped. However, a growing number of high school and college age young men and women have anywhere from three to six years excellent volunteer and/or work experience in camp, swimming, recreation and related programs for the handicapped; they know what they want, whether it be adapted physical education, therapeutic recreation, or special education. These two groups cannot be dealt with in the same way if curricular approaches are to be individualized according to where a student has been and where he is going. In relating this to the five questions posed this morning, what are the essentials in professional preparation and training in these areas? These essentials are basically the same for all individuals who enter comparable programs and with similar goals in terms of jobs, positions, or placement. If one person enters this program with three or four years experience and another enters with no experience, each starts with different competencies and at different levels of fulfilling these essentials. Therefore, programs must be sufficiently flexible to individualize according to different experiences, competencies, knowledges, skills, and attitudes each student brings with him.

We are now in final stages of a professional preparation project funded by Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to develop guidelines for professional preparation programs for personnel in physical education and recreation for the handicapped. Several important concepts indicate direction these guidelines are moving.

> Preparation should be based on competencies needed to perform various tasks in specific positions in these programs. Competencies of an individual moving in the direction of being a recreation director or physical education specialist in a residential facility for mentally retarded will not be exactly the same as for an individual moving into a secondary school adapted physical education program. Since competencies are different -- recognizing that there will be some duplication and overlap -- differences should be reflected in preparation of and guidance given each student. Ability to individualize according to goals and directions of each student is a very important consideration.
>
> Another important principle is to recognize no one way of obtaining requisite competencies. Colleges and universities need sufficient flexibility to recognize alternative ways and means for students to gain competencies. This also relates closely to comments made by the first speaker this morning. Functionally we are operating at the second level; philosophically we are trying to operate at the third level -- the two must be brought closer together.

Another area in which we are operating at level two yet trying to move philosophically and operationally to level three involves attitudinal barriers; negative attitudes and expectations are reflected by the term handicap itself! Handicap as a term and concept is culturally imposed by society on groups of individuals with any one of a variety of physical, mental, emotional or social deficiencies, disabilities, or impairments. About twelve years ago, a congenital quadra-amputee enrolled at the University of Texas where nobody was excused from the two year physical education requirement. When this young man finally accepted that physical education was not to be waived, he selected swimming as an activity. This young man was belligerent, withdrawn, wallowed in self pity, antisocial, along with many other extremely negative characteristics. He and his instructor were the only ones initially allowed in the pool; gradually this changed and a second instructor was permitted in the pool, then another student, and soon another, and later still another. Today this young man is a successful lawyer in Austin; he is much involved in youth work and counsels individuals with conditions much less severe than his -- many of these are handicapped because they let their conditions affect them negatively, emotionally, and socially. This young man is and always will be impaired -- he does not have arms or legs. Disability is the way an impairment affects an individual's ability to perform certain tasks and participate in special activities. This congenital amputee was severely handicapped when he entered the University of Texas. Today, he is still impaired, disabled in certain activities -- not swimming -- but hardly handicapped. A five minute film clip is availbble of him swimming and diving to show what he can do and what he has accomplished.

If this is the way most impaired and disabled look upon themselves, isn't it time society looks upon them in the same way? For too long we have operated at the second level and culturally imposed, categorized, and labeled individuals as handicapped because of blindness, brain damage, deafness, or mental retardation, or other physical, mental, or emotional condition. In fact, many of us are undoubtedly more handicapped than individuals with impairments and disabilities.

A lot of debate and discussion focuses on categorical and non-categorical approaches. Because an individual has an IQ of 52, we are prone to put him in a pigeon hole indicating what he can and cannot do. Yet, in physical education and recreation our primary concern is not with a magic number; we are concerned with an individual's physical ability, motor proficiency, and recreation potential. An IQ of 52 may not affect ability to participate in physical education and recreation activities one bit; case after case shows this. Each person must be considered as an individual in terms of physical ability, motor proficiency, and recreation potential to help eliminate these devastating hardened categories.

One key question must be asked -- can this individual safely, successfully, and with satisfaction take part in a particular activity? If the answer is yes for swimming, movement exploration, arts and crafts, drama, or any other activity, I challenge the practice of placing that individual in a special program for that activity. Emotional stability, social awareness, and effects of intellectual deficiencies upon ability to participate safely, successfully and with satisfaction must be considered along with physical ability, motor proficiency, and recreation potential. Direction then will be more in terms of integrating individuals with any handicapping conditions into regular physical education and community recreation programs instead of indiscriminate and categorical separation in special programs.

Realistically some individuals cannot safely, successfully, and with satisfaction take part in various physical education and recreation activities -- they need special help. Some of these individuals have the potential eventually to participate safely, successfully, and with satisfaction, but today lack experience, skills, confidence, self-discipline, social awareness, emotional stability, or other characteristics. This group needs a halfway house type physical education-recreation program to develop ability to cross over the bridge back into the main stream of society. Others in this group require individual attention, sheltered situations, additional motivation, opportunities for success-- even small successes -- remedial programs, therapeutic activities over long and extended periods of time.

Severely and seriously involved when motivated and given appropriate opportunities do accomplish their impossible dreams. For example, a young Vietnam double-leg amputee completed the 1970 Boston Marathon on a wheel chair in a little over seven hours; this is just a shade over fifteen minutes per mile. He is now training to swim the English Channel. This past spring a young man so severely involved with cerebral palsy that he cannot tie his shoes or cut meat on his plate ran in and won the Artesia (New Mexico) Marathon. He also ran in and completed the Boston Marathon. These are just two of countless examples of individuals who have used sports, athletics, physical education and recreation to re-enter the mainstreams of society.

Undoubtedly the most pressing need in each state is a systematic survey of what is going on and what are problems, issues, concerns, and priorities. Resources could be located, individuals identified, and exemplary programs discovered -- this alone would improve programming many fold. Your state action plans should provide opportunities, machinery, and framework to do many of these things. Vision must be forward and direction promote progress as decisions and recommendations relate to the future.

Non-graded or ungraded programs, team teaching, modular and flexible scheduling, open classrooms, optional class attendance, free school weeks, relevance of activities, core concepts, selective requirements, differential staffing, and other contemporary educational practices must be evaluated and applied in terms of their implications for adapted physical education and therapeutic recreation programs. Dig under surface specifics and the obvious to get to basic principles and purposes; much from other areas and disciplines that on the surface appears irrelevant, inappropriate, and unrelated is appropriate, significant, and applicable to our areas of concern.

Our first speaker considered himself a generalist; many people are surprised that I too consider myself a generalist who makes specific application of broad basic physical education and recreation principles to specific situations in programming for impaired, disabled and handicapped. In an era of over-specialization, psuedosophistication, and too much mumbo-jumbo, credence must be given the importance of deeply imbedded, bedrock, comprehensive, sound developmental physical education and recreation.

# PART III

# INSTITUTE DELIBERATIONS

# PART III

## INSTITUTE DELIBERATIONS BY STATE TEAMS

### Section A

### Exploration and Identification of Issues

The materials in Part III represent the product of the interaction between members of the state teams consisting of professionals from special education, physical education and recreation. The nature of the involvement process for the participants consisted of an exploratory and identification phase which was followed by a development session.

Section A of Part III presents the materials developed by the state teams during the exploration session. The charge to the state teams was to identify the major concerns, issues and needs for their state relative to training programs as related to physical education and recreation for the handicapped and to develop a list from the items identified in order of importance or priority. The reports in this section are the results of the efforts of the state teams to meet this charge.

Members of the state teams who participated in producing the materials in Part III were:

Illinois

Mr. Jerry E. Kelley, Office of Recreation and Park Resources, University of Illinois

Miss Glena Kilgore, Office of Public Instruction, State Department of Education

Mr. Jon Putnam, EMH Handicapped Children Section, State Department of Education

Indiana

Mr. Raymond G. Benson, Education and Activity Therapy, State Department of Mental Health

Mr. Leo Dillon, Supervisor of Programs, State Department of Public Instruction

Dr. Robert YOhO, Health Service Department, State Board of Health

Iowa

Dr. Louis Alley, Department of Health and Physical Education, University of Iowa

Mr. Jerry Caster, Division of Special Education, State Department of Public Instruction

Mr. Donald Lindley, Department of Recreation, University of Iowa

Michigan

Dr. David Fuller, Department of Health and Physical Education, Michigan State University

Mr. Thomas A. Macksood, Flint School Board, Flint Michigan

Minnesota

Dr. Donald Buchanan, Department of Recreation, Mankato State College

Mr. Lawrence Erie, Health, Physical Education and Safety, State Department of Education

Mr. Dennis J. LaRoque, Special Education, Deluth, Minnesota

Missouri

Dr. Frank Colaw, Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education

Mr. Donald M. Cox, Director of Special Education, State Department of Education

Dr. Robert M. Taylor, Health, Physical Education and Safety, State Department of Education

North Dakota

Mrs. Gladys Johansen, Fargo Park District Board, Fargo, North Dakota

Dr. Roger D. Kerns, Department of Public Instruction, North Dakota State University

Mr. Russell Pittaley, Director of Special Education, Richland County Schools

Ohio

Dr. Walter F. Ersing, School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, The Ohio State University

Mr. Robert Holland, Education Consultant, State Department of Education

Mr. James Schimmoller, Education Consultant for Visually Handicapped and Crippled, State Division of Special Education

South Dakota

Mr. Craig Beach, Special Education Consultant, Division of Pupil Personnel Services

Mr. Larry King, Acting Coordinator, Health, Physical Education and Recreation

Dr. Donald McCullaugh, Department of Physical Education and Recreation, University of South Dakota

Wisconsin

Mr. Earl Campbell, Director of Handicapped Programs, Milwaukee Public Schools

Mr. Patrick L. Pflieger, Division of Handicapped Children, Department of Public Instruction

Mr. Donald Voss, Physical Education Director, Walworth County Special School

## NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN ILLINOIS

Mr. Jon Putnam
Miss Glena Kilgore
Mr. Jerry Kelley

1. What competencies are required for working and handicapped children.

2. Communication between institution, agencies, disciplines . . . at the local and state level.

3. Shortage of services for the handicapped in communities . . . activity programs.

4. Who is really concerned about the handicapped?

5. Lack of manpower at all levels, especially trainers.

6. Guidelines for program integration.

7. Need for educating the public as to the training needs, facilities, etc

## NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN INDIANA

Mr. Leo Dillon
Dr. Robert Yoho
Mr. Raymond Benson

1. Unable to identify major concerns until we have better idea of what exists.

2. Focusing on professional preparation-question as to whether colleges and universities direction toward preparation for all physical education and recreation minors offer some exposure to handicapped or is only the "specialist" exposed? Need for survey as to what is available and what is actually happening.

   Some information may be contained in available surveys such as that one completed by Miss Geddes. This survey also contains statements of problems identified by several agencies, schools and departments of states.

   Information also available in conference procedings of conference held at Indiana State University a year ago.

3. Question as to what is philosophy of University and College personnel toward getting the job done. Is there a true committment to follow through?

4. To survey not only larger state supported universities but also Jr. Colleges, private colleges and universities, universities extension services, etc.

5. How much time and effort should professional associations, such as CEC, AAHPER, IPRA, etc., devote to the area of handicapped. Concerned professionals often end up talking to themselves. General sympathy of other professionals must be followed by committment of those who have knowledge and experience.

6. Is there a firm committment of state level leadership to force cross fertilization of ideas and experience. Could such leadership be better provided through private agency such as state ARC?

7. More immediate problem concerns in-service training for those professional and non-professional currently on-the-job. Large and small school systems have their unique strengths and weaknesses. One idea suggests that the state could provide training and resource material to specialists in physical education and recreation in the larger systems while their efforts should be directed toward selected special education teachers in the smaller systems. The special education teachers would then work with the local physical education teacher.

8. Classification of kids too often determined by administrative needs as opposed to needs of kids.

9. Concern for catagorical legislation-existing and proposed--how is legislation refining and emphasizing definitions of disabilities--is this good or bad? Recognition of both aspects and methods of minor negative elements.

## NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN IOWA

Mr. Jerry Caster
Dr. Louis Alley
Mr. Donald Lindley

Community

1. Lack of comprehensive programs (physical education and recreation) in schools and communities.
2. Administrators' attitudes
3. Public information on physical education and recreation

State

1. Lack of state director of health, physical education and recreation.
2. Lack of leadership in the state agency responsible for recreation.
3. Lack of communication among all agencies involved in special education, physical education and recreation.

Training Institutions

1. A need for planned and directed pre-service experience with handicapped. (physical education, special education and recreation)
2. A lack of awareness on part of special educators of the potential of physical education and recreation.

## NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN MICHIGAN

Mr. David Fuller
Mr. Thomas Macksood

A. Development of Teacher Training Programs (courses leading to a teaching minor in adapted physical education)

   1. Interdepartmental cooperation (special education, physical education and recreation)

   2. Interuniversity cooperation

   3. University-community cooperation (provide teacher practicum experiences in local special education programs)

B. Guidelines for developing community resources to facilitate use of recreational areas and facilities by handicapped individuals.

   1. Adaptation of existing facilities (handrails, ramps, special equipment)
   2. Modification (planning states of new areas)
   3. Special arrangements (rates, etc.) for handicapped in local facilities.
   4. Community involvement in the development of State Recreation parks (similar to Georgia's "Will-A-Way")

C. Procedures for writing, printing, and disseminating curriculum materials (program guides, etc.) to teachers of adapted physical education and recreation

   1. Tools for evaluating individual progress in physical development, social-emotional development, and motor-recreational abilities (skills and knowledge)

   2. In-service workshops (physical education; outdoor education) conducted by specialists (adapted physical education) active in the field.

   3. Create a position (state consultant adapted physical education) which includes the responsibility of locating and publicizing exemplary adapted physical education and recreation programs within the state.

D. Preschool Programs (movement education, ages 2-4 years, high incidence EMR areas)

NEEDS, CONCERNS, AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION

IN

MINNESOTA

Mr. Dennis J. LaRoque
Mr. Lawrence Erie
Dr. Donald Buchanan

1. General apathy for providing programs for the exceptional persons.
2. Lack of implementing existing state guidelines and the intent of the law.
3. Lack of pre-service training at the college and university level.
4. More in-service training for elementary and secondary teachers and administrators.
5. Greater emphasis in training of teachers and program development at the elementary level.
6. Lack of interdisciplinary approach towards working with exceptional children.
7. Lack of communication between physical education, special education, and recreation personnel. State and local levels.
8. Lack of understanding and responsibility on the part of the medical profession regarding the importance of physical education and recreation.
9. Lack of time and scheduling for adapted physical education (half-way house).
10. Inadequate facilities, equipment, and supplies to implement adapted physical education and recreation programs.

# NEEDS, CONCERNS, AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN MISSOURI

Mr. Donald M. Cox
Dr. Robert Taylor
Dr. Frank Colaw

1. State-wide steering organization
2. Finance
3. Survey and analyze current operation
4. Determine needs on a priority basis
5. Proper implementation procedures
6. Continuing evaluation

## NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN

## NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Richard Pittsley
Dr. Roger Kerns
Mrs. Gladys Johansen

1. Personnel and facilities in the area are not listed
2. State colleges are not providing training in adapted physical education or recreation
3. Attitudes of physical education, special education and recreation people toward each other and the handicapped
4. Lack of funds for elementary physical education
5. Lack of facilities
6. Lack of qualified personnel in rural areas
7. Facilities available are not being utilized
8. Leadership is not available on the state level
9. Guides for teachers are not available

NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN

OHIO

Mr. James Schimmoller
Mr. Robert Holland
Dr. Walter Ersing

**Concerns**

1. Lack of quality in service models and programs to better prepare personnel to work with handicapped:

   a. Institutions-Resident School

   b. TMR-Day class program

   c. Public School
      1. Handicapped
      2. Regular Education, physical education personnel

   d. Community Recreation

2. Pre-school handicapped--early childhood

3. Lack of Finances

4. Certification for physical education teachers of the handicapped

5. Apathetic public to the benefits of quality physical education and recreation programs.

6. Special Educators be required to have minimum of one physical education course.

7. Priority of physical education personnel in respect to programming for Special Education students, considering other special education needs.

## NEEDS CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Craig Beach
Mr. Larry King
Dr. Donald McCullaugh

A. Concerns:

1. Involvement of policy makers and administrators
2. Role of educational Television
3. Specialized contributions within total framework
4. Public educations and opinions
4. Professional accreditation standings

B. Needs:

1. In-service, coordinated training
2. Programs in rural areas
3. Sponsorship of various program segments
4. State-wide survey of current operations
5. Services of all related organizations and individuals
6. Analysis of student needs, as individuals
7. Formation of state-wide guidelines organizations
8. Professional coordinators
9. In-state, regionals or area organizations
10. Financing on all fronts

C. Possible Issues:

1. Prime responsibilities for programs control--possible solution: Integrated responsibility.

NEEDS, CONCERNS AND/OR ISSUES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION IN WISCONSIN

Mr. Patrick Pflieger
Mr. Donald Voss
Mr. Earl Campbell

Statement of Problem

Lack of awareness of needs of the handicapped child. Same as for any child, difference is the approach, methods, adaptation, modification (name of the game).

Objectives

To educate, train more recreation personnel to realize they should be serving needs of handicapped. Flexibility--encourage suburban areas to cooperate. Encourage parental involvement.

Resources

Extension service WPRA-exceptional education, department MIL University of Wisconsin, Madison, State Department of Instruction, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of Interior.

Program Objectives

1. Improvement of recreation programs for handicapped children.

Rationale:

All children can learn mainly through their perceptual senses--sight, smell, taste, touch, hearing--activity programs can assist in gross motor and fine motor development. Recreation can provide increases stimuli and motivation.

Activities and Needs--same as for any child. These are:

1. Motivation to achieve
2. Social awareness
3. Physical welfare
4. Environmental experiences
5. Oral experiences
6. Home-School-Relatives

Our objectives for kids is fun and to improve the competencies of:

1. Mobility
2. Manual dexterity
3. Self Image (achieve)
4. Language (staff and other)
5. Parent-child relationships, parental involvement.

Encourage more communities to program for handicapped children. To cooperate with other communities to start programs. Encourage parents to pressure for legislation.

The end product of such activities is to achieve stated objectives. The result would be the same as education--to have all children lead a more productive life.

Resources

WPRA exceptional education department
University of Wisconsin, Madison
State and United States' Departments of Instruction
Natural resources

Funds

Title I, if recreation department can be associated with school board or agency receiving Title I funds may be other sources. I am aware of Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, or Department of Interior.

# PART III

## INSTITUTE DELIBERATIONS BY STATE TEAMS

### Section B

### State Team Action Plans

The materials in Section B of Part III represent the product of the interaction within the state teams to structure a plan of action that would assist in developing or extending the professional preparation services needed within their state. Each state team selected the need or problem which they judged to be crucial in stimulating an awareness for and development of programs of physical education and recreation for the handicapped.

To assist the teams in developing State Action Plans with similar formats, each were encouraged to utilize an Action Plan model consisting of a statement of the problem, objectives, scope of plan, resources and concluding statement. The results of each state team's input to the development of the State Action Plan is presented in the following pages.

The State Action Plans presented in this section serve the purpose of providing programs to stimulate and develop professional training services needed for physical education and recreation programs for the handicapped. Each State Plan is designed to make a specific thrust and is not intended to be all encompassing. Each represents a beginning to affect change within the specific state as well as a committment by those involved in developing the model to assist in their eventual implementation.

In presenting the various State Action Plans in this report, it is hoped that those individuals involved in this area from other states will utilize the models as a future resource in their efforts to extend training opportunities and develop programs in physical education and recreation for the handicapped.

## ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

## ILLINOIS

Mr. Jon Putnam
Miss Glena Kilgore
Mr. Jerry Kelley

### Statement of Problem

The basic problem as we see it in Illinois is a lack of awareness and adequate communications within and between agencies, institutions and organizations working with the handicapped child. This would include:

A. Knowledge of existing programs, services, conferences and workshops that are available to our personnel in the state.

B. Administrative and supervisory awareness of contributions from other disciplines, ie., physical education and recreation.

C. Inadequate distribution of literature and information.

D. Cross-discipline training opportunities.

E. No state-level personnel to coordinate programs and services for handicapped children.

### Objective

Develop a state-wide action plan to facilitate improved communications and coordination of services.

### Scope of Plan

1. Establish a coordinating committee made up of state level leaders in special education, physical education, and recreation and other disciplines working with the handicapped.

2. Include appropriate information in existing publications regarding the goals and objectives of this state-level committee.

3. Seek funds to sponsor state level workshop concerned with coordination of efforts and/or develop new programs in existing training meetings.

### Resources

Representatives to be included in state coordinating committee:

1. IAHPER
2. ITRS
3. ICEC
4. IASE
5. IPRS
6. Professional Education (PE, SE, REC)
7. DVER (Handicapped Division)
8. Grass-roots participants
9. DMH

Concluding Statement

It is our suggestion that a small group of persons get together to identify and select the representatives to participate in state coordinating committee. It should include: Leonard A. Hopkins (DMH), John Putnam and Bob Carpenter (Handicapped Section, OSPI), Jerry Kelley (ORPR, University of Illinois), Stan Labanowich (ITRS), Robert Sepesey (Board of Voc. Ed. and Rehab. Special Programs Unit), Glena Kilgore (OSPI), Dan Kennedy (University of Illinois), Ellen Kelley (Illinois State University, Normal), and Toru Wood (Southern Illinois University).

Meeting to be held in Champaign and to be hosted and coordinated by Dan Kennedy.

ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION
FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

INDIANA

Mr. Leo Dillon
Dr. Robert Yoho
Mr. Raymond Benson

Statement of Problem

The problem results from a number of actions of ommission and commission on the part of state leadership; therefore, the basic problem is the absence of an intelligent and sincere committment by state leadership to a program utilizing the resources of special education, physical education and recreation for the benefit of children who deviate from the normal.

1. Secure committment from state leadership to implement an interaction of special education, physical education and recreation skills to improve programs for the disabled child.

2. The establishment of a mechanism by which the voluntary and official agencies at the local and state level can, on a continuing basis, keep informed on agency and department activities and plan joint strategies in program development.

3. Review and evaluation of existing state legislation.

4. Develop a plan for identifying and assessing existing programs for handicapped children, state and local level.

5. Develop a plan for identifying and assessing present programs of professional preparation in colleges and universities for:

   a. Special education teachers in physical education and recreation at the undergraduate, masters and doctoral level.

   b. Physical education teachers and recreation leaders in child growth and development--special education?

In-service Education

Develop a plan to reach the large and small schools.

Large School System--Operational factors:
Special Education Teacher
Interest in area
Time to give program
Flexible schedule

State leadership--provide training experiences for recreation and physical education specialist. Materials, Knowledge, Resources, Phylosophy, Motivation.

Recreation and physical education specialist provide, on a regional basis, training of special education teachers--activities, knowledge, material, recources.

Small School Operational Factors:

Physical education and recreation specialist
Small classes
Flexible program or no program
Facilities

State leadership provide information and understanding of physical education and recreation to special education teachers on a regional basis:

a. resources in physical education and recreation
b. materials
c. philosophy of physical education and recreation

Selected special education teachers provide training for physical education and recreation personnel:

a. special education philosophy
b. Knowledge about handicapped
c. resources in special education

Resources

Precedent established in 1970 of agency cooperation and funding of resources having instruction in physical education for special education, physical education and recreation personnel at Indiana State University.

Special olympics at Indiana State University (precedent)
Study of the status of professional education done by Mrs. Geddes, ISU 1970.
Select personnel from colleges and universities, Department of Public Instruction, Department of Mental Health, voluntary agencies and professional or local individuals with special skills and interest.
Funds available through special education Division of Public Instruction
Department of Mental Health, State Board of Health, (federal, state, private)

Nature of Funds:

Specifically for the retarded, Department of Public Instruction
Developmental disability Act. Department of Mental Health
3142 (Black Grand, Maternal and Child funds (certain percent) through Board of Health.
Project Grant funds (federal) to colleges and universities, State appropriations
Private funds, voluntary agencies.

Concluding Statement

After having said this, we are concerned, and impressed by Dr. Frymier's stress on the personalization of education and expressions here which support the concept which reminds us of the years and years that education has verbalized on the subject of all education tailored to the individual's needs.

Therefore, the longer range goal should be improvement of the total educational program with emphasis on individualization of the learning process resulting in the ideal program for all children rather than catagories of children. This would necessitate the development of improved evaluation instruments and techniques that more nearly assure that children, no ill be assigned to activities and learning experiences that contributes most to their growth and development.

ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION
FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

IOWA

Mr. Jerry Caster
Dr. Louis Alley
Mr. Donald Lindley

Statement of Problem

Three main needs exist that can be addressed at this time. These are:

1. the need for interdisciplinary communication
2. the need for assessment of current physical education and recreation activities
3. the need for public information

The purpose of the Action Plan is to establish a foundation for continued progress in physical education and recreation for the handicapped which would integrate existing resources.

Objectives

Action Program for the Need for Interdisciplinary Communication

By December 1, an exploratory meeting will be held to identify Iowa concerns and needs in physical education and recreation for the mentally retarded and the handicapped. The meeting will involve at least the following agencies: University of Iowa, IARC, DPI, (SE, and DVR), DSS (Govenor Committee on Employment for the Handicapped), Conservation Commission, IPRA, IAHPER. A report of the meeting and decision regarding future action will be sent to each member in attendance.

By September, 1972, a meeting will be held to evaluate the results of surveys and to determine action projects. Represented will be at least the following agencies: University of Iowa, IARC, (SE, and DVR), DSS, Conservation Commission, IPRA, IAHPER, and Governors Committee on Employment for the Handicapped. A report of the meeting and decision regarding future action will be sent to each member in attandance.

Action Program for the Need of Assessment

By June, 1972, a survey will be completed to determine the needs of physical education instructors working in programs for the mentally retarded. The survey will be conducted by Dr. Louis Alley with results distributed to appropriate agencies.

By June, 1972, a survey will be completed to determine the needs of recreation regarding services to the mentally retarded and physically handicapped. The survey will be completed by Dr. Donald Lindley.

By February, 1972, an assessment of the needs of individuals providing summer recreation/camping experiences will be completed by Mr. Jerry Caster. Results of the assessment will be used to determine need for in-service training of individuals providing direct services.

Action Program for the Need for Public Information (Professionals)

By June, 1972, articles pertaining to physical education and recreation for the handicapped will be submitted to the Iowa Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation newsletter by Dr. Louis Alley.

By June, 1972, one or more articles will be submitted to the IPRA newsletter regarding recreation for the handicapped by Dr. Don Lindley.

By June, 1972, three newsletters to teachers of the retarded and three newsletters to supervisors of mentally retarded programs will contain information on physical education and recreation for the handicapped. To be done by Mr. Jerry Caster.

By June, 1972, one article on physical education will be submitted to Hope (IARC Publication) by Mr. Jerry Caster.

Scope of Plan

The scope of the plan includes the time frame from September 1971 through August 1972. There has been previous activity in physical education and recreation for the handicapped in Iowa and the plan will emphasize decision making on existing needs and alternatives for meeting those needs.

Resources

The plan will use existing resources with attention given to the allocation of future resources.

Concluding Statement

Accordingly, this action plan is a preliminary outline to be used for the development of a more complete plan devoted to meeting the physical education and recreation needs of the handicapped.

Involvement of all appropriate individuals/agencies in decision making and priority setting is deemed essential if the physical education and recreation needs of the handicapped are to be met.

ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION
FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

MICHIGAN

Mr. Thomas Macksood
Dr. David Fuller

Priority Reviewed

Teacher Training Programs, undergraduate and master degree levels.

Objectives

1. To establish college programs to provide teaching certification in physical education for the handicapped, and/or therapeutic recreation.

2. To promote in-service workshops which provide for the professional growth of teachers (practitioners and prospective teachers of the handicapped).

3. To establish an information center which could provide resource materials related to programs in physical education and recreation for the handicapped.

Scope of Plan

1. a. Contact physical education, recreation, and special education departments of Michigan colleges and universities. Survey what is presently being offered (courses in Adapted Physical Education, etc.)

   b. Meet with selected representatives:
      Higher Education--departments of physical education, recreation, and special education.
      State Department--special education, physical education
      Professional organizations (Michigan) MAHPER, MARC, etc.

   c. Review in such a meeting the following:

      Identify present offerings in teacher preparation
      Examine available guidelines (present AAHPER project on professional preparation for teachers of the handicapped, etc.
      Suitable content (courses and requirements for certification)
      Determine available funds for developing recommended programs
      Explore possible inter-university cooperation in program offerings.
      Identify resource people (present teachers, etc.)within the state

   d. Define immediate objectives and select a committee to pursue means of implementing them. (To include suggestions relative to the following)

2. Plan workshop opportunities through:

   State Department consultants (physical education, special education)
   Regional District representatives (interstate cooperative effort)
   Available state and federal funding.

3. Develop an information center:

Possibly to operate in conjunction with ERIC-Michigan State University
To collect and disseminate state and out-of-state information
To serve as a resource for teachers or anyone interested in physical education and recreation for the handicapped.

# ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

MINNESOTA

Mr. Dennis J. LaRoque
Mr. Lawrence Erie
Dr. Donald Buchanan

## Statement of Problem

There exists at present in Minnesota some programs for the handicapped that are offered by special education, physical education and recreation personnel. However, these programs are not coordinated and developed to their full potential.

Therefore, there is a dire need to develop an action plan to implement, coordinate and develop to the fullest potential existing programs, guidelines, and the laws now existing that would provide:

1. developmental physical education,
2. adaptive physical education,
3. recreation.

## Objectives

1. To draw together those state and local organizations and/or agencies who have potential input into the development of a comprehensive and viable program for handicapped persons.

2. To develop in-service programs for physical education, special education, recreation personnel, and school administrators.

3. To work with institutions of higher education in upgrading pre-service training of potential physical education, special education, and recreation personnel.

4. To provide more effective consultant services for school and municipal programs.

5. To identify competencies needed for physical education, special education, and recreation personnel to work with handicapped persons.

6. To identify good programs now in existence in the state to serve as models.

7. To disseminate information through various media to better inform the public as to the need for better programs.

## Scope of Plan

Organize a state steering committee of an interdisciplinary nature to delineate steps for implementation of the state action plan.

## Resources

1. Resource Personnel:
   a. Special Education Consultants
   b. Physical Education Consultants

c. Recreation Consultants
d. Physical Therapists
e. Occupational Therapists
f. Service Organizations
g. State Professional Organizations
h. Medical Doctors
i. Nurses (community health, and public school)
j. Guidance Counseling
k. Psychiatrists and Psychologists

2. Financial Resources:

a. Special Education in-service funds
b. Federal and State Recreation funds
c. Provate Foundations
d. Federal Title Programs
e. Local tax funds
f. United Fund
g. Parent Organizations
United Cerebral Palsy
Association for Retarded Children
Minnesota Society for Crippled Children
Other associated organizations who foster and promote programs for the handicapped.

3. Materials

a. NRCA, AAHPER, Journal of School Health, American Medical Journal, Journal of the Exceptional Child, Journal of AAMD

Concluding Statement

In view of the foregoing, the Minnesota team represented at this Institute will assume responsibility for initiating the organization of a State Steering Committee that will implement the Minnesota State Action Plan.

# ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

MISSOURI

Mr. Donald M. Cox
Dr. Robert Taylor
Dr. Frank Colaw

## Program Goal

Provide comprehensive and adapted physical education and recreational programs for all handicapped students.

## Statement of Problem

How best to collect data concerning the needs of the handicapped in physical education and recreation from the State of Missouri.

## Objectives

To decide where we are, where we are going, how we plan to get there, and how to evaluate the outcome of the directions taken.

## Scope of Plan

1. Organization of the disciplines available within the state and local area. (higher education, State Department, Legislature, etc.)

2. Involve all supporting agencies such as Mental Health, Cerebral Palsy, Early Childhood Division, etc., in planning and implementing the plan.

## Resources

We shall use all the resources that are available to the state. Universities, Mental Health Centers, Medical Schools, ERIC, AAHPER, National Institute of Mental Health.

## Concluding Statement

In order to bring about the program goals of providing comprehensive and adapted physical education and recreational programs for all handicapped students in Missouri, we must bring together all people and sources interested in human beings. We feel that this is a start in the right direction.

# ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. Richard Pittsley
Dr. Roger Kerns
Mrs. Gladys Johansen

## Statement of Problem

There exists a need in the state to make significant thrust in public information, professional preparation, leadership training and interdisciplinary cooperation.

## Objective

In attempting to initiate planning in making the necessary thrusts, a steering committee will be established to plan an institute that will stimulate action plans within the state. Suggested make-up of the steering committee would be Miss Janet Smaltz, Dr. Ann Carlson, Mr. Jim Trowsgord, Mr. Richard Pittsley, Dr. Roger Kerns, and Mrs. Gladys Johansen.

## Scope of Plan

The steering committee would plan to meet at a dinner meeting some time during the third or fourth week of October. Agenda items at this meeting would be:

1. Plans to mail results of regional conference
2. Press release on program information
3. Review our needs--additional feed back
4. Identify who needs to do what and when
5. Develop state plan for leadership training
6. Establish a state action committee

# ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

OHIO

Mr. James Schimmoller
Mr. Robert Holland
Dr. Walter Ersing

In-service Education for Special Education and Physical Education Personnel Emphasizing Adapted Physical Education at the Elementary Level.

## Statement of Problem

Many special education teachers have limited knowledge and skills in teaching physical education and recreation activities.

## Objective

To design and conduct an effective in-service education model.

## Scope of Plan

Select a metropolitan area in which to conduct an in-service education program for special education teachers and physical education and recreation personnel. Additional participants may be invited from the Title VI regional area.

The end products would be:

a. a beter prepared teacher
b. a more imformed school administrator
c. a higher quality of physical education and recreation program

## Resources

Projected cost will be covered by registration fees including possible credit from a cooperating college or university.

## Concluding Statement

Final planning and arrangements will be conducted and/or coordinated with local schools, regional Title VI, State Department of Education, and cooperating colleges or universities.

If this plan is well received, it could serve as a model to be used in any of the 17 special education (Title VI) regions throughout the state.

# ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

# SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. Craig Beach
Mr. Larry King
Dr. Donald McCullaugh

## Statement of Problem

No active task force or group of people responsible for this area of concern exists in the state. Exceptional children of South Dakota are not receiving an equal opportunity to participate in physical education and recreation. Services need to be initiated.

## Objectives

1. Educate the public regarding adaptive physical education programs now in operation in the state of South Dakota. Thereby increasing the awareness of the public of what adaptive physical education is trying to accomplish.

2. Develop workshops in adapted physical education and encourage colleges and universities to offer courses in this area. Seek assistance from Joseph P. Kennedy Foundation and other possible resources.

3. Develop or adopt a guide designed to assist physical educators in organizing a program of adapted physical education.

## Scope of Plan

Each individual within state that would benefit from this type of program initially youth, eventually adult.

## Resources

People--Civic Professional groups
Individual--Community and Professional leaders
Money--Federal, state, local funds, private and civic donations
Materials--utilization of existing natural resources

## Concluding Statement

A comprehensive organizational thrust is necessary. We feel this can be done by unifying key people across the entire state and alerting them to the importance of such an endeavor.

ACTION PLAN FOR PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION
FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED IN

WISCONSIN

Mr. Patrick Pflieger
Mr. Donald Voss
Mr. Earl Campbell

I. Practicum experience with handicapped for physical education and recreation undergraduates.

Statement of Problem

For the past few years, Wisconsin State University, Whitewater has conducted a program whereby undergraduate students in special education, as a requirement of completion of certain courses, have a specified number of hours working with the handicapped.

1. Walworth County Special School (Elkhorn) EMR-TMR
2. Bethesda Luthern Home-Watertown Residential Home for Mentally Retarded
3. St. Colletta's School-Jefferson Residential Home for Mentally Retarded
4. Central and Southern Wisconsin Colonies and Training Schools at Madison and Union Grove, respectively.
5. Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh has a similar program at sophomore level for special education undergraduates. Winnebago State Hospital for mentally ill and emotionally disturbed and Winnebago Cerebral Palsy Easter Center for multiplehandicapped children are two of the practicum sites.

The problem is that to our knowledge, only special education graduate students have been involved in this program. Recreation major is offered at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. Physical education majors are offered at the University of Wisconsin, Madison; Wisconsin State University, LaCrosse. Most other state Universities offer physical education minors.

Our premise holds that those undergraduate students in physical education and recreation should at least be exposed to the various exceptionalities, since many will work with exceptional children upon graduation. This could be accomplished through a required undergraduate introductory course dealing with various exceptionalities and/or practicum experiences with exceptional children in a school setting (either residential, institutional or public school). Another solution to the problem would be to encourage senior students to practice teach or intern with exceptional children.

Objectives

1. Establish and maintain communication with teacher-training institutions which offer majors and/or minors in physical education and recreation.

2. Enlist the aid of Wisconsin Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation to aid in establishing communication with physical educators presently teaching to identify possible training sites.

3. Create a state-wide awareness of the need for comprehensive programs of physical education and recreation for the exceptional child.

4. Explore possibility of teacher training institutions initiating an introductory course on the exceptional child for undergraduate students in physical education and recreation.

5. Provide institutions of higher learning with a list of available practicum sites (public school classes, residential, institutional) with the hope that they will offer their undergraduate students an opportunity for practicum experience with exceptional children.

   a. Undergraduate practicum (volunteer or required)
   b. Practice teaching-internship

Scope of Plan

1. Initial contact by letter, including questionnaire type survey, which will explain action plan.
2. Follow-up telephone contact.
3. Contact with WAHPER
4. Organizing a sounding board session
5. Organizing a committee to implement action plan

   a. Physical Education Departments to allow undergraduates to have practicum experience with exceptional children, prior to senior year.

   b. Physical Education Departments to allow undergraduates to take either a required course on exceptional children or elective.

   c. Senior year student teaching with exceptional as well as normal.

Resources

1. State DPI Division for Handicapped Children--state supervisor physical education and recreation.

2. Wisconsin State University Physical Education Departments and Special Education.

3. University of Wisconsin-Madison and Milwaukee physical education and special education.

4. Wisconsin Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

5. Funds: a. Title VI-B; b. Educational professional development act 88; c. 88-164 money for in-service teacher training.

Concluding Statement

It is our intent to implement a state-wide plan whereby physical education undergraduates receive a course introducing them to the various exceptionalities and receive practicum experience before the senior year and practice teaching in exceptional children.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# PART IV

## SUMMARY MATERIALS

## MAJOR ISSUES AND CONCERNS

## PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION AND SPECIAL EDUCATION

The identification of the major issues and concerns confronting physical education, recreation and special education was achieved by means of the Adelphi Survey process. Essentially the process involved the identification of one primary issue or concern by each of the conferees relative to their discipline. A list of issues/concerns for physical education, recreation and special education was developed from the initial responses and then resubmitted to the participants with the instruction to rank order the issues/concerns from one to ten.

### Physical Education - Recreation

The results of the rank order for the responses from the physical education and recreation representatives indicate their most pressing concern was the need to develop a state plan to coordinate the training needs. The desire for improved interdisciplinary cooperation between special education, physical education and recreation appeared as the second most frequently ranked concern, while the problem of indifference by the public for the physical education and recreation needs of the handicapped ranked third in importance.

The rank order of the ten most pressing concerns/issues in physical education and recreation as identified by the representatives from the two disciplines at the Institute was:

1. Develop a state plan
2. Improve interdisciplinary cooperation between Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation
3. Lack of public concern about Physical Education and Recreation needs of the handicapped
4. Practical experience for undergraduates
5. Curriculum development which is not "traditional in design"
6. More trained personnel needed

7. Better preparation of school administrators

8. Retrieval, storage and dissemination of information in Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped

9. More effective utilization of existing funding resources

10. More emphasis on evaluation of training programs

Special Education

The responses of the conferees from special education indicated similar concerns among the higher items as the physical education - recreation group. The foremost concern ranked by the special education was the need for improved interdisciplinary cooperation. The second ranked item was the need to make practicum experiences more productive while the third issue was the lack of public concern for the physical education and recreation needs of the handicapped.

The rank order of the ten most pressing concerns/issues in special education as identified by the representatives from the special education at the Institute was:

1. Improve interdisciplinary cooperation between special education, physical education and recreation

2. How to make practicum experience more productive

3. Lack of public concern about physical education and recreation needs of the handicapped

4. Provide more flexible programs

5. Programs that do not isolate from the "normal"

6. Lack of consultive services for the handicapped

7. Obtaining more funds

8. Development of model training programs for state and local levels

9. Better preparation of school administrators

10. Retrieval, storage, and dissemination of information in physical education and recreation for the handicapped

A review of the rank order list of the issues/concerns for the two groups reveals a considerable agreement between the kinds of items identified by the

conferees. Of the first three items from each group, two were identical but not in the same rank order. An examination of the twenty ranked items revealed only six which did not appear in the list for both groups. In conclusion, the Aldelphi Survey showed more agreement as to the items of concerns/issues than disagreement.

## GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Each of the preceeding statements contains the essense of the participants' response, expressed either orally or in writing through the evaluation tool used to critique the conference. The highlights of their evaluative remarks are presented below.

The group felt the Institute served as a valuable means of bringing individuals from three disciplines together who are committed to a program of total education for the mentally retarded and physically handicapped and opening lines of communitation between these individuals that had not existed previously.

An examination of the training issues, problems and needs identified by the participants revealed items common among most of the participating states as well as many which were unique to one state. In the process of exploring and identifying training needs, the participants raised many questions which are worthy of further study. Among these are: How can communications and cooperation be improved between the three disciplines? What can be done about the lack of public concern for physical education and recreation? What kind of practicum experiences should be designed for students? How may physical education and recreation professional preparation models provide more flexibility?

On the basis of the participants' feelings expressed at the Institute, the following conclusions were evident:

1. The participants had acquired new information from their interaction with other disciplines which stimulated the development of new viewpoints, sensitivities and possible attitude changes.

2. The number of professional preparation curriculum in physical education, recreation and special education seem to be adequate but that more innovative designs for and greater flexibility within present programs need to be developed.

3. Practicum experience is an essential training ingredient and, as such, needs not only to be incorporated in professional preparation programs, but carefully designed to be a productive experience.

4. A need for improved interdisiiplinary communications at all levels - state department, higher educational institutions, school systems and community - was a common pressing problem expressed by most participants.

5. There is a lack of public concern in general about physical education and recreation needs of the handicapped and that organized public information programs need to be implemented to change the prevaiding attitude.

6. Although generally recognized as limited, present funding resources at the local, state and federal level need to be more effectively utilized.

The Institute served as an effective means in initiating an examination of the major concerns, issues and needs relative to training programs in physical education and recreation. In addition, action plans were developed for each state for the purpose of initiating an approach to solving one problem as identified within the concerns, issues and needs.

Those participating recognized that their personal involvement has assisted in creating new interdisciplinary relationships and greater awareness to training problems and needs of each of the disciplines. The action plans express the conferees' desires for improvement through change. Any eventual change will require continued dialogue and in-depth study of professional preparation needs supported by on-going programs to meet current needs.

# APPENDIX

## INSTITUTE PERSONNEL

### Institute Committee

Dr. Walter F. Ersing, Institute Director
Special Project Director
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
337 West 17th Avenue
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Mr. Robert Holland, Supervisor
Ohio State Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. Joseph Huber, Special Project Assistant
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
337 West 17th Avenue
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

### Resource Participants

Mr. William Hillman
Division of Training Programs
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Department of Health, Education and Welfare
Washington, D. C. 20202

Miss Delores Geddes, Project Director
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Ms. Edna Engberg
Assistant Professor
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
Illinois State University
Normal, Illinois 61761

Mr. Dan Kennedy, Project Coordinator
Department of Recreation and Park Administration
College of Physical Education
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Dr. Julian Stein, Consultant
Programs for the Handicapped
Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation
1201 16th Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

## Midwest Institute Participants

### Illinois

Mr. Jerry E. Kelley, Assistant Professor
Office of Recreation and Park Resources
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61822

Miss Glena Kilgore
Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction
316 South Second Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706

Mr. Jon Putnam
Assistant Director
EMH Handicapped Children Section
1020 South Spring Street
Springfield, Illinois 62706

### Indiana

Mr. Raymond G. Benson, Director
Education and Activity Therapy
Indiana Department of Mental Health
1315 West Tenth Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

Mr. Leo Dillon, Supervisor of Programs
Indiana Department of Public Instruction
Room 108, State Office Building
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Dr. Robert Yoho
Health Service Department
Indiana State Board of Health
1330 West Michigan Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206

### Iowa

Dr. Louis Alley
Director of Physical Education
Department of Health and Physical Education
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

Mr. Jerry Caster
Department of Public Instruction
Division of Special Education
Grimes Building
East 14th and Grand Avenue
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Mr. Donald Lindley
Assistant Professor
Department of Recreation
115 Field House
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52240

Michigan

Dr. David Fuller
Department of Physical Education
Women's Intramurals
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Mr. Thomas A. Macksood
Flint School Board
2601 Stevenson Street
Flint, Michigan 48504

Minnesota

Dr. Donald Buchanan, Chairman
Department of Recreation
Mankato State College
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

Mr. Lawrence Erie, Assistant Supervisor
Health, Physical Education and Safety
Minnesota Department of Education
Capitol Square Building
St. Paul, Minnesota

Mr. Dennis J. LaRoque, Director
Department of Special Education
226 North First Avenue East
Deluth, Minnesota 55802

Missouri

Dr. Frank Colaw
Superintendent of Schools
Board of Education
St. Charles, Missouri

Mr. Donald M. Cox, Director
Department of Special Education
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Dr. Robert M. Taylor
Health, Physical Education and Safety
State Department of Education
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

## North Dakota

Mrs. Gladys Johansen
Fargo Park District Board
2105 North Eighth Street
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Dr. Roger D. Kerns
Department of Public Instruction
North Dakota State University
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

Mr. Russell Pittsley, Director
Department of Special Education
Richland County Schools
Wahpepon, North Dakota

## Ohio

Mr. Robert Holland, Supervisor
Ohio State Department of Education
65 South Front Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215

Mr. James Schimmoller
Education Consultant for Visually Handicapped
and Crippled
Ohio Division of Special Education
3201 Alberta Street
Columbus, Ohio 43204

## South Dakota

Mr. Craig Beach
Special Education Consultant
Division of Pupil Personnel Services
804 North Euclid
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Mr. Larry King, Acting Coordinator
Health, Physical Education and Recreation
State Capitol Building
Pierre, South Dakota 57501

Dr. Donald McCullaugh
Department of Physical Education, Recreation
and Athletics
University of South Dakota
Vermillion, South Dakota 47069

## Wisconsin

Mr. Earl (Gene) Campbell
Director of Handicapped Program
Milwaukee Public Schools
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201

Mr. Patrick L. Pflieger
Department of Public Instruction
Division for Handicapped Children
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin

Mr. Donald Voss, Director
Department of Physical Education
Walworth County Special School
Elkhorn, Wisconsin 53212

MIDWEST INSTITUTE FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION,
PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION

A Study of Training Needs in the Programming of Physical Education
and Recreation for the Mentally Retarded
and Physically Handicapped

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

| | |
|---|---|
| 1:00-7:30 p.m. | Registration |
| 7:30-9:00 p.m. | Social Hour-Banquet Room |

Thursday, September 16, 1971

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 a.m. | Official Welcoming Session<br>Dr. Donald Anderson, Associate Dean<br>College of Education<br>The Ohio State University |
| 9:15 a.m. | "Regional Conferences: Design and Purpose"<br>Mr. William Hillman, Jr.<br>Division of Training Programs<br>Bureau of Education for the Handicapped |
| 9:30 a.m. | Keynote Address<br>"Knowledge, Society, and Individual: What is Essential?"<br>Dr. Jack R. Frymier, Chairman of the Faculty of Curriculum and Foundations<br>The Ohio State University |
| 10:15 a.m. | Reactor Panel to Keynote Address<br>Dr. Orville Johnson, Chairman, Faculty of Exceptional Children, The Ohio State University<br>Dr. Louis Alley, Director<br>Department of Health and Physical Education<br>University of Iowa<br>Dr. Donald McCullaugh<br>Department of Physical Education and Recreation<br>University of South Dakota |
| 10:45 a.m. | Coffee Session |
| 11:00 a.m. | "Training Perspectives: What's Happening and What Should Be Happening in Special Education"<br>Dr. James Beaber, Associate Professor<br>Area of Exceptional Children<br>The Ohio State University |
| 12:00-1:00 | Lunch |

| | |
|---|---|
| 1:00 p.m. | "Training Perspectives: What's Happening and What Should Be Happening in Physical Education and Recreation"<br>Dr. Julian Stein, Project for the Handicapped<br>A.A.H.P.E.R.<br>Washington, D. C.<br>Presiding: Miss Dolores Geddes<br>School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation<br>Indiana State University |
| 2:00 p.m. | State Team Exploration and Identification Session |
| 3:00 p.m. | Coffee Session |
| 3:15 p.m. | Report Session by State Teams |
| 6:00 p.m. | Hospitality Hour |

Friday, September 17, 1971

| | |
|---|---|
| 9:00 a.m. | Report of Mid-Continent Regional Conference<br>Dr. William Chasey,<br>University of Texas<br>Austin, Texas |
| 9:30 a.m. | Action Plan Development Session |
| 11:00 a.m. | Sounding Board Session |
| 12:00 noon | Lunch |
| 1:00 p.m. | Presentation of State Action Plans |
| 2:30 p.m. | Evaluation and Closing Remarks |
| 3:00 p.m. | Adjournment |

MIDWEST REGIONAL INSTITUTE

EVALUATION FORM

Instructions: Please check the column that generally represents your answer to the question.

| | Yes | No | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Was the promotion effective? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Did the participants understand what was was expected of them? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Were the meeting facilities adequate? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 4. Were the dining and housing facilities adequate? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 5. Was registration handled effectively? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 6. Were helpful study materials made available? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 7. Were the general sessions: | | | |
| a. Relatively free from distractions? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. Characterized by good physical arrangements? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. Made meaningful by clear presentation? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| d. Appropriate in length and number? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| e. Clear as to goals and purposes? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| f. Effective as to the use made of educational techniques, subtechniques and aids? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 8. Were the special state interest groups: | | | |
| a. Made up of persons who: | | | |
| 1. Had common interests? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Could work together? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 3. Were similar in background? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. Adequate as to physical arrangements? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. Well conducted? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| d. Staffed with appropriate resource persons? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| e. Clear as to their goals and task? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| f. Appropriate as to: | | | |
| 1. Frequency of meeting? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Length? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| g. Effective as to the use made of educational techniques, subtechniques and aids? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 9. Were the discussion, practice, or work groups: | | | |
| a. Well conducted? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. In suitable surroundings? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. Clear as to their: | | | |
| 1. Task? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Responsibilities to the total group? | ____ | ____ | ____ |

| | Yes | No | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|
| d. Appropriate as to: | | | |
| 1. Length? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. Frequency of meeting? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 10. Did the coordinator and staff: | | | |
| a. Carry out responsibilities? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. See that the group was well oriented: | | | |
| 1. Prior to arrival? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 2. After arrival? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. See that schedules were met? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| d. Properly instruct the resource persons? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| e. Help the participatts to learn? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| f. Remain flexible and able to make adjustments to aid learning? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 11. Did the resource people: | | | |
| a. Understand their responsibilities? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. Understand the techniques they were involved in? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. Use understandable language? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| d. Use helpful examples? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| e. Remain available for consultation? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| f. Present information clearly and effectively? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 12. Did the participants: | | | |
| a. Make advance preparation? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. Make use of their opportunities for learning? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. Attend meetings on time? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| d. Cooperate with the coordinator and resource persons? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| 13. What was accomplished? | | | |
| a. Was useful information presented in the general sessions? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| b. Did the participants show evidence of having acquired information, new viewpoints, or of having changed attitudes? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| c. Was progress made toward the goals? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| d. Have problems or needs emerged which point toward further study or action? | ____ | ____ | ____ |
| e. Was there evidence of willingness to accept responsibility for further study or action? | ____ | ____ | ____ |

14. Feel free to list any comments regarding the Institute on the back side.

Appendix C

Order Form For Institute Report

A Study of Training Needs in the Programming of Physical Education and Recreation for the Mentally Retarded and Physically Handicapped: A report of the Midwest Regional Institute for Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation.

Compiled and Edited by Walter F. Ersing, Ph. D.

Contents

Part I General Presentations
"Regional Training Institutes: Their Design and Purpose," by Mr. William Hillman, Jr. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped and "Knowledge, Society, and Individual: What is Essential?" by Dr. Jack Frymier, The Ohio State University.

Part II Training Perspectives in Special Education, Physical Education and Recreation
"What's Happening And What Should Be Happening In Special Education," by Dr. James Beaber, The Ohio State University, and "What's Happening and What Should Be Happening In Physical Education And Recreation" by Dr. Julian Stein, American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.

Part III Institute Deliberations
This part consists of two sections, Section A which deals with the issues, concerns and problems in training for physical education and recreation for the handicapped as identified by interdisciplinary teams from ten Midwest States. Section B presents an Action Plan developed by each of the participating state teams for the purpose of affecting change in one area of need.

Part IV Summary
This section includes the results of the Adelphi Survey and a discussion on conclusions resulting from the Institute.

Appendix
The appendix includes a list of the participants, institute program, and evaluation form.

---

ORDER BLANK

No. of copies at $1.50/copy. Amount due_____. Please enclose check or requisition for above amount (Make check payable to P.E.R. Special Institute).

Name_____

Address_____

City_____State_____Zip_____

Mail to: Walter F. Ersing, Special Institute
School of Health, Physical Education and Recreation
337 West 17th Avenue
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210